

# The Classical Review

NOVEMBER 1891.

## MR. BAYFIELD ON CONDITIONS 'CONTRARY TO FACT.'

IN the *Classical Review* for May, 1890, the Rev. M. A. Bayfield makes a vigorous attack on the familiar grammatical doctrine that the form of conditional sentence expressed in Greek by the secondary tenses of the indicative with *εἰ* in the protasis and *ἄν* in the apodosis, and in Latin by the secondary tenses of the subjunctive, necessarily contains a supposition which is known or implied to be contrary to fact. Mr Bayfield utterly denies the truth of this doctrine, and asserts that the only difference between the sentences 'If he did it, he did wrong' and 'If he had done it, he would have done wrong' [*εἰ ἐποίησεν, ἠδίκησεν* and *εἰ ἐποίησεν, ἠδίκησεν ἄν*] is that the latter form presents the hypothetical statement 'less positively' than the former.

Mr. R. C. Seaton and Mr. Caskie Harrison, each in a very brief note in the *Review*, have expressed their dissent from Mr. Bayfield's position, but neither of these scholars attempted a discussion of the question, based upon the interpretation of the passages which Mr. Bayfield cites in support of his view. As sentences do occasionally crop up, which seem at first glance to be at variance with the rule, it may be worth while to examine briefly Mr. Bayfield's argument.

He begins by saying that if it be true that the form of sentence in question necessarily contains a condition contrary to fact, then, if a Greek or Roman had wished to express the following thought: 'If a man had heard Demosthenes, could he ever have forgotten it?' he could not have done so without implying thereby that, in fact, no one ever heard the orator. 'Truly, a terrible conclusion!' adds Mr. Bayfield. Later in his article he brings forward another illustra-

tion in the following words: 'In an unthinking moment a master gives his form the following sentence to translate into Latin or Greek: "Even a Stoic would have jumped, if a wasp had stung his nose." The boy, seeing the words "would have jumped" and "if a wasp had stung," is about to turn the sentence correctly, but, unfortunately, he pauses and reflects. Reflection brings him to the conclusion that a wasp might have stung even a Stoic, and he writes down anything but what he ought.'

To answer the argument which Mr. Bayfield would draw from these illustrations will require only a moment's reflection upon a distinction which is not, so far as I know, referred to in any of the treatises on this subject, but of which the recognition will materially assist in seeing the question at issue in its true light. There are some conditions which are contrary to settled and known facts, as, for instance, 'If Caesar had not crossed the Rubicon he would not have become master of Rome.' But, besides these, we find, at rare intervals, and expressed in the same grammatical form, sentences which contain suppositions possible enough in themselves, but which the writer finds it convenient to regard for the moment as contrary to fact. Such conditions may be called 'subjectively contrary to fact.' And these latter illustrate the rule just as truly as the former class. In interpreting any formula of language the proper test is not the external fact, but the intention of the writer; the form in which he chooses to present his thought. The sentences quoted from Mr. Bayfield above are excellent examples. When we say 'If a man had heard Demosthenes, he could not have forgotten it,' we forget, for the moment, all those persons who ever

heard the orator, and confine our thought to those who did not have that privilege. This is shown by the very form of the sentence. No one would say 'If he had heard, he would not have forgotten,' except when thinking of some one who, in the opinion of the writer, had not heard. And so in Mr. Bayfield's other example. When we say 'Even a Stoic would have jumped, if a wasp had stung his nose,' whatever may be the real probability of such an occurrence, the form of the sentence shows that the writer is thinking of the case as not having actually taken place. Subjectively, at least, it is contrary to fact. If the writer had been thinking of an actual Stoic and an actual wasp, he would have used a different form of expression.

With so much by way of preface, let us briefly examine the passages which Mr. Bayfield quotes in support of his view. The first is from the *Ion* of Euripides, 354. Creusa is asking after the fate of her lost son, and in reply to the question 'How long is it since the child was made away with?' she says

σοὶ ταῦτόν ἦβης, εἴπερ ἦν, εἴχ' ἂν μέτρον.

Mr Bayfield argues that since she is inquiring about the child's fate, she is not thoroughly convinced of his death, and therefore the condition εἴπερ ἦν cannot properly be called contrary to fact. In reply to this we need only say that although she is not sure, yet she is practically certain that the child is dead, as is shown by l. 348

θῆράς σφε τὸν δύστηνον ἐλπίζει κτανεῖν,

and therefore, when asked his age, in her despair she adopts the form of statement suitable to her state of feeling. In short, this is a clear case of a condition subjectively contrary to fact.

The next case cited is from Plato's *Meno*, 93 E. Socrates says of Cleophantus, son of Themistocles, οὐκ ἂν ἄρα τὴν γε φύσιν τοῦ νείους αὐτοῦ ἡγιάσαι' ἂν τις. Here Mr. Bayfield remarks: 'We must here supply the suppressed protasis "if the occasion had arisen," or the like, and are we to say that no occasion ever arose for expressing an opinion of Cleophantus's natural endowments?' Mr. Bayfield here falls into the common error of confusing the so-called 'Potential Indicative' with the similar conditional form. In this case there is probably no reference at all to any definite protasis, for the Potential Indicative is often used to express 'past possibility, probability, or necessity'<sup>1</sup> with

no condition implied. This sentence, then, is probably not to be regarded as conditional, in the strict sense of the word, and therefore does not bear on the point at issue. If, however, any one insists upon supplying the protasis, the sentence becomes subjectively contrary to fact, and should be interpreted 'If an occasion had arisen,' referring to one which did not actually arise, 'no one would have found fault with the natural endowments of Cleophantus.'

Precisely this latter statement applies to Mr. Bayfield's next instance, Xen. *Hell.* III. iv. 18, ἐπερρώσθη δ' ἂν τις ἰδὼν καὶ ἐκεῖνο, Ἀγησίλαον κ.τ.λ. This does not imply that no one ever saw Agesilaus, but merely that the author adapts the form of his statement to refer to those who did not see him, rather than to those who did.

In Plato's *Meno*, 84 D, Socrates says ὥστε εἴπερ ἦν τοῦτο (ἀρετῇ) διδακτόν, ἐξευρεῖν ἂν (Θουκυδίδην) ὅστις ἐμελλεν αὐτοῦ τοὺς νείους ἀγαθοὺς ποιήσειν...εἰ αὐτὸς μὴ ἐσχόλαζε. On this Mr. Bayfield argues: 'Here we are not justified in assuming either (1) that Socrates anticipated the conclusion of the dialogue, and implies that virtue cannot be taught (his own words at the end of the passage are "perhaps virtue cannot be taught"); or (2) that Thucydides is supposed to have had plenty of leisure to instruct his own sons.' On this latter point Mr. Bayfield falls into the remarkable error of supposing that the second protasis, εἰ αὐτὸς μὴ ἐσχόλαζε, is part of the un-real complex. A little closer inspection would have shown him that it is not at all so intended, but that it is added as an independent afterthought and merely signifies 'if he himself, as might naturally happen, had not sufficient leisure.' And on the first point his reasoning is equally erroneous. When Socrates says 'If it were true that virtue can be taught,' he is anticipating the conclusion of the discussion, i.e. that virtue cannot be taught, as the whole context clearly shows. εἴπερ ἦν τοῦτο διδακτόν means 'if virtue could be taught, as I affirm it cannot be.' And Mr. Bayfield's translation of the concluding words, 'perhaps virtue cannot be taught,' is a very weak rendering of the Greek ἀλλὰ γὰρ μὴ οὐκ ἢ διδακτόν ἀρετῇ, as every one will admit who remembers Socrates' habit of stating his firmest convictions in this modest form.

The last passage quoted by Mr. Bayfield is Sophocles, *Oed. Tyr.* 220 f.

οὐ γὰρ ἂν μακρὰν  
ἔχονεν αὐτὸς μὴ οὐκ ἔχων τι σύμβολον.

Here he says: 'The condition (meaning the

<sup>1</sup> Goodwin's *Moods and Tenses*, p. 82.

condition expressed in the participial clause) is obviously fulfilled. Oedipus has no clue, but by a natural idiom he states his actual position hypothetically. "I am altogether a stranger to this matter, and accordingly am about to make a proclamation, for I should not be tracing the crime far if I had no clue; but now (since I intend to get a clue) I make proclamation," &c.' Mr. Bayfield's error here arises from the assumption that the chief protasis of the sentence is found in the clause *μη οὐκ ἔχων τι σύμβολον*, whereas this is, in fact, of quite subordinate importance, the leading protasis being supplied from what immediately precedes. The thought, correctly stated, is as follows: 'I intend to summon you all to assist me in tracking the murderer, for, if I did not do so, I should not be making much progress in the search, unless indeed I had some clue, which of course I have not.' With this interpretation, <sup>1</sup>which is the only one which suits the context, the sentence is in perfect harmony with the rule.

We have now examined all the passages which Mr. Bayfield adduces from Greek writers. Space will not permit a detailed examination of the Latin examples, on which he seems to lay less stress, but one or two may be touched upon in passing. Livy, 22, 54, in speaking of the battle of Cannae says: 'Nulla profecto alia gens tanta mole cladis non obruta esset.' This plainly means 'If any other nation had suffered this defeat it would have been overwhelmed. But Rome suffered it and did not fall.' And yet Mr. Bayfield cites the sentence as containing an implied condition which is not contrary to fact. So too in the prophetic lines in the *Aeneid*, VI. 880, 881,

<sup>1</sup> See Jebb and Schneidewin-Nauack.

non illi se quisquam impune tulisset  
obuius armato,

Mr. Bayfield fails to observe that the poet, by an easy change in the point of view, is referring to the untimely death of Marcellus, and that the unreal condition 'if he had lived' is plainly to be supplied.

But further discussion of these passages is unnecessary. Every one must admit that not one of them affords any good ground for Mr. Bayfield's position. And yet he is betrayed, near the close, into a still stranger assertion. 'It would appear then,' he goes on, 'that the rule does not hold. Indeed no conditional sentence can, of itself, convey any implication either as to the facts, or the speaker's impression of the facts. The hearer knows, if he knows at all, by independent information already in his possession.' To this inexplicable assertion even Mr. Seaton, in his brief note of protest referred to above, seems to yield a partial assent, when he says 'I admit I cannot at the moment point to a case in which this information (that the condition is regarded as unfulfilled) is conveyed by the conditional sentence alone, but that fact by no means proves that it could not have been so conveyed.' It certainly cannot be necessary to introduce in this article sentences in illustration of so familiar a usage as this. But perhaps we cannot close this paper more fitly than by suggesting that if we should courteously say to Mr. Bayfield 'If your arguments *had been* as sound as they were cleverly put, we *should have been* convinced,' our meaning would have been sufficiently clear, without any 'independent information' whatever.

EDWARD B. CLAPP.  
*Yale University.*

#### NOTES ON SOME FRAGMENTS OF MENANDER.

My attention has been called to the following passages by a paper of Dr. Robinson Ellis's in the *American Journal of Philology* (Vol. xi. No. 2), of which he kindly gave me a copy. The numeration used is that of Kock's *Fragmenta Comicorum Graecorum*, vol. 3.

I take first a couple of apparent instances of a special kind of corruption. Words, or letters, meant as guides to construing have been written above a line; a subsequent copyist has mistaken them for words to be inserted in

the line, and has inserted them accordingly; and sometimes either his or a still later hand has altered the rest of the line to accommodate the insertion.

The first instance is to my mind so absolutely certain that I regret, on turning to Kock, to find that Bentley has made the emendation before me—but where and on what grounds I know not: I only know that his correction has been received by Kock but rejected by Ellis.

Fr. 462.

τὰς δὲ ὀνθυλεύσεις καὶ τὰ κεκαρυκευμένα  
μᾶλλον προσεδέξατο χεται Ἀρκαδικὸς τοῦναντίον  
ἀθάλαστος ἐν τοῖς λοπαδίοις ἀλίσκεται.

[‘So A, the best MS. of Athenaeus. VL  
give προσεδέξατ’ εἰ δέ τις ἔρχεται Ἀρκαδικός.’—  
Ellis.]

Read

μᾶλλον προσεδέξατ’ Ἀρκαδικὸς τοῦναντίον  
*Process of corruption.* προσεδέξατ’ is an  
aorist with present sense: so some one wrote  
χεται above it thus

ΧΕΤΑΙ

ΠΡΟCEΔEΞΑΤ

meaning ‘προσεδέξατ’ = προσδέχεται.’ A later  
copyist mistook ΧΕΤΑΙ for a word to be  
inserted, and hence the reading of A.

Then came the scribe of a MS. now  
lost. He emended ΧΕΤΑΙ into ΕΡΧΕΤΑΙ  
and wrote ΠΡΟCEΔEΞΑΤ ΕΡΧΕΤΑΙ  
ΑΡΚΑΔΙΚΟC. Over this he or some one  
else wrote εἰ δέ τις thus

ΕΙ ΔΕ ΤΙC

ΠΡΟCEΔEΞ ΑΤΕΡΧΕΤΑΙ ΑΡΚΑΔΙΚΟC

meaning ‘ἔρχεται is hypothetical and = εἰ δὲ  
ἔρχεται. Ἀρκαδικός is not a personal but a  
generic name and = τις Ἀρκαδικός.’ So we  
get the reading of VL.

Fr. 1098.

ὁ γέλωc ἀν μὴ ἦ τοῦ γέλωτος ἄξιος  
αὐτὸς πέφυκε τοῦ γέλωτος κατάγελως.

Ellis reads ὁ γέλωc ἀν ἦ μὴ τοῦ γέλωτος  
ἄξιος, but I submit that ἀν = εἰ must be  
long in a poet of Menander’s time and that  
consequently the emendation does not  
comply with the requirements of the  
metre.

If, as Liddell and Scott say, the α in εἰ  
itself is always long, it will not do to sub-  
stitute ὁ γέλωc εἰ ἦ. I suggest that we  
ought to read

ὁ γέλωc, εἰ μὴ τοῦ γέλωτος ἄξιος,

Omissions of a subjunctive copula are not  
unknown in Greek, and ἄξιος frequently dis-  
penses with an indicative copula; but if we  
put commas after γέλωc and ἄξιος no copula  
seems wanted at all.

*Process of corruption.* Above and be-  
tween μὴ and τοῦ ΗΙ was written as a guide  
to the construing. A later copyist mistook  
it for a word to be inserted, and then εἰ

<sup>1</sup> We might indeed read εἰ μὴ γέλωτος, but (1)  
the change proposed would be greater, and (2) it  
would be less easy to account for the corruption of  
the line.

was shortened into εἰ in an ignorant attempt  
to mend the ruined metre.

It is true that in Soph. O. T. 1062 MSS.  
read

οὐδ’ ἂν ἐκ τρίτης ἐγὼ

μητρὸς φανῶ τριδουλος ἐκφανεί κακή  
but<sup>2</sup> I have no reasonable doubt that the  
line stood

ΕΚ

ΟΥΔΕΑΝΤΡΠΙΤΗCΕΓΩ

the ΕΚ being simply a guide to the con-  
struing of the unusual genitive: it was mis-  
taken for a word to be inserted, and then  
to save the metre ΕΑΝ was reduced to  
ΑΝ.

My attention has been called by Dr.  
Ellis to the fact that in an epigram attri-  
buted to Nicarchus (*Anth. Pal.* xi. 74, 9)  
there is an instance of ἀν = εἰ. Supposing  
that the crucial words are sound and as  
early as Nicarchus, they are still probably  
several hundred years later than Menander:  
but the epigram, as Dr. Ellis informed me,  
has also been assigned to Lollius Bassus,  
and if it were indeed by him we might dis-  
miss ἀν = εἰ as the pardonable mistake of a  
Latin.

I pass to other emendations.

Fr. 481.

ὁ προσδιατρίβων δὲ σκοπιάσας ἀπώλεσε

Read

ὁ προσδιατρίβων δ’ ἐσκοπίας’ αὐτ’ ὤλεσε

Menander has just finished describing the  
advantages of dying before you can reach  
old age—

βελτίονα  
ἐφόδι’ ἔχων ἀπῆλθες, ἐχθρὸς οὐδενί—

and he proceeds

ὁ προσδιατρίβων δ’ ἐσκοπίας’ αὐτ’ ὤλεσε,  
κακὸς τε γηρῶν ἐνδείξ που γίνεται

‘but he that lingers on espies (or, is always  
observing) his losses,’ i.e. becomes melancholy  
over departed friends and pleasures.

*Process of corruption.* ΑΤΤΩΛΕCΕ was  
misread ΑΠΩΛΕCΕ and ΔΕCΚΟΠΙΔC  
was then supposed to represent δὲ σκοπιά-  
σας.

*Alternative hypothesis.* ACC was written  
for αὐτ’ (cf. ἀθάλαστος above for ἀθάλαττος).  
Over it some one wrote ATT either as a  
correction or as a guide for reading. This was

<sup>2</sup> When I wrote these words, I supposed from the  
authorities before me that ἀν was read by all  
MSS. But according to Blaydes one MS. (Aug. c)  
actually does read οὐδ’ εἰ ἐκ τρίτης ἐγὼ.



misread ΔΠ and brought into the line, and then owing to false division the previous C was dropped as unintelligible.

Fr. 362. ἦν { δῆλον οὔτι } νυμφίος τε ἀλφάνει.  
ἦν { οὔνι }

As regards the end of the line, Bentley's τότ' is probably correct. The Ε of papyri often has a very long middle stroke, and if the downstroke of the second Τ were lost in a vertical fissure of the papyrus the word might easily be read as ΤΕ.

As for the rest of the line, I feel sure that the key to it lies in the reading οὔνι. Οὔτι is far more likely to be a correction of

οὔνι (indeed Ε actually has οὔνι) than οὔνι a corruption of οὔτι, and it is not easy to see how the Τ and the Ν can both be corruptions of a common original.<sup>1</sup> I suggest that οὔνι

<sup>1</sup> Bentley's δηλονοτι is not, indeed, quite out of the question, because ΟΤΙΗ can be written in a papyrus hand so as to be almost indistinguishable from ΟΥΝΙ.

represents ΕΥΝΙΝ, which I should take to be an acc. of εὔνις, 'a bedfellow.' The confusion between Ε and Ο is of course common. The final Ν might be lost (1) by the word coming at the end of a line (the fragment is embedded in prose) and Ν being indicated, as is often the case, only by a thin stroke—above, (2) by the eye slipping to the next letter, which is also an Ν. Accordingly I propose

ἦν δῆλον εὔνιν νυμφίος τότ' ἀλφάνει.

Fr. 330.

Ἄλλ' οὐ τὰ βίον νῶν ἴσως δεῖ φροντίσαι.

Here Bentley's unaccepted emendation βίον seems to me morally certain. In majuscule cursive Τ and Υ were often alike written Υ. Hence ΒΙΟΤΟΥ might be written ΒΙΟΥΟΥ, and this corrected into βίον.

EDWARD W. B. NICHOLSON.

#### EURIPIDES' ANTIOPE.

##### 4.

2.—Ζεύς does not fill the gap. Should one read ὡς εἶπερ ἡμᾶς Ζεύς γε ἐγέννησεν πατήρ?

4.—I still think that πάντων in the papyrus must be miswritten for πάντως. The converse error (πάντως for πάντων) is of frequent occurrence.

10.—I presume that all are now agreed in accepting

καὶ σοὶ μὲν οὕτω, μήτερ, ἐξανδῶ τάδε

proposed by Mr. Headlam in the April number, and simultaneously in a letter to me from Professor E. L. Lushington. (The traces on the facsimile appear not inconsistent with | εν.) But the editors do not seem to be aware of the *rhythmical* improbability of ἀλλὰ σὺ μὲν οὕτω κ.τ.λ. as formerly proposed.

14.—The ε of τόδε appears unelided in the facsimile.

15, 16.—I still think that a slight modification of my former suggestion—viz.

νῶν δ' οὖν πρὸς ἄγραν τ' εὐτυχῶς εἴη λιμὴν

δόλω θ' ἔλωμεν ἄνδρα δυσσεβέστατον—is not improbable.

17.—I prefer ἀλλ' οὗτος τοῖς ἀλλ' αὐτοῖς.

19–21.—The facsimile does not seem to me to bear out some of the letters of the

transcription here. I am still inclined to suggest what I thought of at first:—

Λύκος. ποῦ 'σθ' ἦν λέγονσι τήνδε προσ-  
βῆναι πέτραν  
δρασμοῖς συνθείσαν; τίς δ' ἄρ' ἦν ἥδε  
στέγη;  
τίνας δὲ ναίοντο[ν] ὄντες ἐκ ποίας πάτρας;  
σημάναντο δέ παιδα δ' οἰκητὴν πέτρας  
κ.τ.λ.

The four remaining lines of the fragment are indeed in hopeless case. But there are traces which suggest

ηλ[θον].....βλ[αστ]ηματα  
β[ῆ]λλοντες.....ταμα[των]  
χωρα[νικησθε].....πειρω[μενοι]  
.....νπ.....ημ[ερα]

##### B.

On the fragment now marked B I have to remark generally that I still approve of this order, and still hold to the drift of my former attempted reconstruction.

2.—In particular the letters στυγ following the ε of ἀνθρώπε seem to me clearly indicated in the facsimile.

4.—This is also true of νιν at the end of l. 4.

15.—The conjectural παῖδα Νυκτέως, which

I put forth with some confidence in March, is better supported since the publication of the facsimile. The following changes in my reconstruction are now required:

- 1.—κακὸς γυναῖκας ἦδομαι κακῶς λέγων.
- 7.—πῶς οὖν ἀριστ' ἂν τοὺς ξένους ἔχοιμ' ἰδεῖν;
- 9.—οἱ δ' οὖν ἀφείνται καὶ δυοῖν παραστατῶ.
- 12.—παῦροί γε λόγχας δ' οὐκ ἔχουσιν ἐν χερσίν.
- 13.—ὕμεῖς ἂν οὖν φρουροῖτε περίβολον πέτρας,
- 14.—ἐκτὸς μένοντες, κἂν τι καινὸν ἦ, δόμων
- 15.—φύλακες· ἐγὼ δὲ παῖδα Νυκτέως ἐμῇ
- 16.—μάρψω βίβ' καὶ χειρὶ καὶ τάχ' εἴσεται

## C.

## Left-hand column.

1-4.—W-M.'s restoration of these lines is very spirited. That of 5-7 is less probable.

8.—Probably χο. εα' εα.

14.—I now suggest that ἔπεισεν has arisen out of a dittographia of ἔλαβεν and that the reading of Stobaeus is a further corruption.

15.—ἔλαβεν ὅταν τῶν τιν' ἀσεβῇ βροτῶν?

21.—Seems to be rightly restored by Prof. Mahaffy.

24, 5. Qy.—

Ἐρμῆς. ὕμᾱς κελεύω πεδίον ἐξορμωμένους  
ἔλθειν, ἀναξ' Ἀμφιον· ἐντολὰς δέ σοι

32.—Rather λκα...? e.g. ἐστάλκατε, ἐσφάλ-  
κατε?

## Right-hand column.

Here I am compelled to relinquish my too rash hypothesis. But I still find it difficult to restore the last thirteen lines without supposing that some lines have dropped out.

44.—A nearer parallel is *Antig.* 1124 according to the reading of L.

46-8.—I still suggest, though hesitatingly,

εὐ μὲν χθονὸς τόννευμα, πολεμίων λαβών,  
Ζήθ', ὡς πρὶν ἐκπύνει σὺ τὴν δ' Ἀμφίονι  
λύραν καταινῶ διὰ χερῶν ὠπλισμένον κ.τ.λ.

51.—My suggestion

δέμας δὲ μητρὸς εἰς νεοῦργ' ἐδώλια  
does not appear to stand condemned.

52.—Qy. νεότεκτον ἐσθλῶν τεκτόνων θήσει  
χερί?

63.—I cannot but think that a line has been dropped after 62. Line 63 may then have begun with ἐσφράγισας (suggested by Prof. Mahaffy's conjecture), e.g.

τούσδε δ' ὡς Δίον γένος  
ἐσφράγισας δοκοῦντας οὐκ εἶναι Διός.

64.—I read εφ. ρε, i.e. ἔφερε.

71.—Ἐρμῇ, δέμας δάμαρτος εἰς κρήνην βαλὼ  
γυναῖκα θάψας, τῆσδ' ὅπως ἐνούσα γῆς  
νασμοῖσι τέγγη κ.τ.λ.

LEWIS CAMPBELL.

## LATIN ACCENTUATION.

(Concluded from p. 377.)

III. Another theory of the Grammarians is equally entitled to credit, viz. the distinction by Accent of some words of the same form, but of different sense. These words are:—

(1). Interrogative (or Exclamatory), and Relative (or Indefinite), Pronouns, the former taking the ordinary accent, the latter resigning their accent in favour of the following word, e.g. *qualis fuit Cicero!* but *talis est qualis Cicero fuit*. The usual statement of the Grammarians, who were no doubt influenced by the analogy of the Greek accentuation of *ποιός* and *ποιός*, is that the latter class, e.g. *qualis*, the Relative, are accented on the last syllable; but this is corrected by Quintilian (I. 5. 26), who points out that what really happens is that the relative is joined to the following word. Priscian (V. 67, p. 183 H.) objects similarly to a statement of Hellenizing Grammarians

that *quis*, the Indefinite Pronoun, in *siquis*, *numquis*, etc., is an Enclitic like *tis* in *εἷς*, and prefers to call *siquis* a compound, with the natural accent of a compound word. We may then believe that *qualis* had as an Interrogative or Exclamatory Pronoun a certain independence in pronunciation which was wanting to the Relative *qualis*, and that Interrogative *quis* might similarly be distinguished by the ear from the Indefinite Pronoun of the same form. The Scholiast Aeron on Hor. S. I. 2. 17,

*maxime quis non | Juppiter! exclamat simul atque audivit*,  
remarks that *quis* should have in this line its 'interrogative pronunciation' (interrogative pronuntiandum). Similarly no doubt *ubi*, *unde*, *quō*, *quī* were distinguished by a certain stress when interrogative from the corresponding Relative and Indefinite Pronouns, though it is doubtful whether this distinction could have been discovered from

a study of Plautus and Terence alone, had it not been mentioned by the Grammarians.

(2). Other examples are more questionable, such as *nē*, 'verily,' *nē*, prohibitive, *ne*, 'lest': *ādeo*, the verb, and *adēo* the adverb (*ādeo* is the metrical accentuation in Plautus and Terence both of verb and adverb): *ūt*, 'how,' *ut*, 'in order that': *ērgo*, 'therefore,' *ergō*, 'on account of.'

On the other hand the distinction seems to be well founded between

(3). Adverbs and Prepositions; viz. that the former are accented, while the latter resign their accent to the following noun. Thus we should say *supra est*, but *supra moenia est*; *ante venit*, but *ante Caesarem venit*; and so Quintilian (I. 5. 25), speaking of the distinction in sound between *circum*, Acc. of *circus*, and the Preposition *circum* says: cum dico 'circum litora' tamquam unum enuntio dissimulata distinctione, itaque tamquam in una voce una est acuta. He makes the same criticism of the ordinary statement that disyllabic Prepositions are before the Noun 'accented on the last syllable' as of the similar statement about Relative and Indefinite Pronouns, viz. that it is truer to say that they are 'joined to the following noun.'

With regard to Prepositions the rule of the Grammarians, as modified by Quintilian, is simple and credible. When preceding the Noun they form a sort of compound with it and lose their Accent; when they follow the Noun they take the Accent which they had lost. The close connection of a Preposition with its Noun is shown by the practice in old MSS. and Inscriptions of writing the two words as one, e.g. *edavo* for *e Davo* in MSS. of Terence, and by the fact that for metrical purposes a Preposition and its Noun are treated by Plautus and Terence as one word. In Mil. 1284,

*aliū alio pacto propter amorem nē sciam*, the two short syllables of the Anapaest in the fourth foot cannot belong to different words. *Propter amorem* must be to all intents and purposes a single five-syllabled word. The shortening too of *ad* in Rud. 904 *sed ad prandium uxor mē vocat*, if we compare it with the shortening of *ab* in Stich. 418 *age abdūce haece intro*, shows not only that *ad prandium* was treated as one word, like *abduco*, but also that no Accent fell on the Preposition in ordinary pronunciation.

IV. A study of the Prosody of Plautus and Terence will show us another fact about the pronunciation of Prepositions in Latin, which is not mentioned by Latin Gram-

marians, but which has abundance of parallels in other languages, viz. that Prepositions were accented before monosyllabic Personal Pronouns, the Pronouns being left accentless, unless the Pronouns were specially emphasized, in which case they take the Accent away from the Preposition. In Greek we have *πρός με*, *πρός σε*, in English 'with him,' 'for him,' and in the Celtic languages the practice has been carried so far as to reduce the Pronouns to mere suffixes, e.g. Old Irish for-m, 'on me,' for-t, 'on thee,' etc. That in Latin the pronunciation was *ad me*, *abs te*, *in se*, and so on, cannot be doubted by any one who has read through a play of Plautus or Terence with attention to the treatment of such phrases. In the *Trinummus* for example there is hardly an instance where the Preposition has not the Accent except in lines like v. 196 *apud tēst*, where the pronoun is emphatic, and in a few like v. 97 *ad te adveni*, where the Pronoun is elided. We have, v. 421 *abs te accepi*, v. 619 *ergā te*, v. 733 *penēs me*, and so forth, all evidently following the ordinary accentuation; this explains why *apud me erit* Merc. 585 is allowed as the ending of an Iambic line. It is only in *erit* that the metrical ictus is at variance with the natural accent. In his Prolegomena p. cxxvii. Ritschl postulates the same accentuation for *inter eos*, *praeter eos*, and the like.

Priscian (XIV. 6, p. 27 H.) tells us that in *mecum*, *tecum*, *secum*, *nobiscum* the Preposition is Enclitic, but has the Accent in *quocum*, *quacum*, *quibuscum* (cf. *nobiscum* Amph. 951: *quibuscum* Heaut. 388 etc.). So also *quam propter*, *quas propter*, *quapropter* is perhaps the usual accentuation in Plautus.

V. That Conjunctions, like Prepositions, had a different pronunciation according as they came first or second in the sentence is asserted by Priscian (XIV. 1, p. 24 H.): *praepositae gravantur omnibus syllabis*, *postpositae acuuntur in principio*. He refers expressly to *igitur*, *quoniam*, *saltem*, so that he would have us pronounce e.g. *igitur Cicero venit* but *venit igitur Cicero*. Whether the shortening of *si* in *siquidem* (in the Comedians also *siquidem*) is to be explained by the accentuation *siquidem* is not certain. Bücheler (A.L.L. iii. p. 144), who quotes other examples of the kind in Early Latin Poetry, e.g. *tūquidem*, seems rather to regard it as due to a sort of metrical compensation, the addition of the extra syllables to the long monosyllable being compensated for by the shortening of

the long vowel. This is a well-known feature of the Welsh language, and is common enough in English too, e.g. 'clean' but 'cleanly,' 'cleanliness': 'know' but 'knowledge,' but it has not yet been ascribed to Latin. That the monosyllabic conjunctions *sed*, *et*, and the like, were Enclitic words in the sentence hardly requires proof, though Ritschl (Prolegomena p. ccliii. sqq.) has shown in a conclusive way how they with relative pronouns and other 'Sentence Enclitics' (such words in fact as we omit in writing telegrams) are carefully kept in the theses of the line:—

e.g. Trin. 2 *sequor sed finem fóre quem dicam nescio.*

It might also be proved from the Romance languages, where the Latin monosyllabic Conjunctions have suffered the same phonetic changes as the unaccented syllables of Latin words. *Et*, for instance, if the word had been accented, would have become '*iet*,' or some similar form, instead of Ital. *e*, Fr. *et*, Span. *y*, just as *veto*, *vétat* have become Ital. *vieto*, Fr. *viede*, Span. *vieda*. Of the disyllabic Conjunctions in Plautus *quidem* is joined to the preceding word, so that for example *nōsquidem* is allowed only in those parts of the line in which a dactyl word is allowed: *ēgoquidem*, *ēdquidem*, *ibiquidem* show the usual accentuation of quadrisyllabic words with the first three syllables short: *hū(c)quidem* is regular, *ū(d)quidem* occasional: *nempe* is always the metrical equivalent of one long syllable, and according to editors should be pronounced *nemp(e)* before a word beginning with a vowel, *nē(m)pe* before a word beginning with a consonant. Ritschl rejected the other possible explanation, viz. that the pronunciation in both cases was *nemp(e)*, the apocope of the final *e* being due to the proclitic nature of the word, e.g. *nemp' recte* Bacch. 188, though it has the analogy of *atque*, before consonants *ac*, to support it. Plautus' treatment of *quidem* is perhaps in keeping with the accentuation prescribed by Priscian, and so is his practice of making *non enim* always a dactyl, and never a cretic, in dialogue metres (see Seyffert in Bursian's *Jahresbericht* 1890, p. 23).

VI. Other words which must have been occasionally Sentence Enclitics are the Personal and Possessive Pronouns. It is true that Priscian (XVII. 55, p. 141 H.) expressly says that there is no distinction in Latin corresponding to the Greek distinction between *εἰδέν με* and *εἰδέν ἐμέ*, *οὐκ ἐκείνον*: *apud nos autem pronomina eadem et discretiva sunt ut 'vidit me' vel 'videt me,*

*illum autem non'*; but he seems to refer rather to the identity of the written form of the emphatic and unemphatic Pronoun, than to that of their intonation in discourse. In the Romance languages, owing to the influence of the Accent, two distinct series have been developed for the Personal Pronouns: (1) the enclitic e.g. Ital. *mi*, *ti*; Fr. *me*, *te*; (2) the accented, e.g. Ital. *me*, *te*; Fr. *moi*, *toi*. Similarly a Vulgar-Latin Possessive *\*mus*, *\*mum*, *\*ma* beside the regular *meus*, *meum*, *mea* is indicated by French *mon*, *ma*, and vulgar-Italian *madonna*, *padre-mo*, etc. In Plautus the distinction between emphatic and unemphatic *me*, *te*, etc., can be very clearly seen in phrases like *abs tē* and *abs te*, *in mē* and *in me*. In fact, as we have already seen, these monosyllabic Personal Pronouns never take the accent when preceded by a Preposition unless they are emphatic. It may be too that phrases like *patēr vocāt me* Amph. 991 (where the two iambic words would hardly be allowed in succession unless the actual pronunciation were *vocāt me*), *servā me* Curc. 628, and the like, are examples of an enclitic use of the Personal Pronoun with the Verb, similar to that which we find in the Romance languages: e.g. Ital. *prestatemi il libro*, *non mi parlate più*.

The enclitic nature of the Possessive Pronoun is indicated in Plautus by the small metrical weight which it occasionally has in the line, e.g. Trin. 990, *vāpulis meo ābitratu ēt novorum aedilium*,

where *meo* (monosyllabic) is absorbed by the metre, and hardly counts as a syllable at all. *Meus*, *tuus*, etc., receive the metrical treatment of other disyllables when they are emphatic, as in

*Capt.* 261 *ūt vos hic itidem illi apud vos meus servatur filius* (MSS. *illie*);

*Trin.* 329 *dē meo nam quōd tūmst meūmst: omne meūmst autēm tūm* (so the MSS.);

or *Men.* 282 *meūm parasitum!* where the staccato tone of the repeated words expresses the surprise and incredulity of the speaker. We have already remarked that the enclitic Possessive occurs in phrases like *volūptās mea* (so always at the end of a line), *fratēr mī*, and we may add that Festus (p. 428, de Ponor) speaks of the spelling *sis* etc., for *suis* etc., in Old Latin, in the line of Ennius, for example:

*postquam lumina sis oculis bonus Ancu' reliquit.*

That the Demonstrative Pronouns, like the Personal and Possessive, were slurred



in pronunciation, unless they required special emphasis, is clear from their metrical treatment in Plautus, where *ille*, *iste*, and before a consonant *hic*, *hōc*, *id*, etc., meet one on every page. *Huius* receives a different treatment in such a line as Poen. 394:

*oculus huius, lippitudo mēa, mel huius, fēl meum,*

where it is emphatic, from its slurred form in *huiusmodi* (a Cretic); and in the phrase 'I am he,' where the Demonstrative is spoken with stress, we have always *is ego sum*, or *ego is sum* in Plautus, which contrasts with the ordinary *intēr eos, proptēr eos*. The Romance forms point to (*il*)*lum patrem* etc., (*il*)*la mater* etc., as the origin of the Definite Article in all the Romance languages, while *ille pater* seems to have been pronounced sometimes *il(le) pater*, e.g. Ital. *il padre*, Span. *el padre*, Prov. *el paire*, sometimes (*il*)*le pater*, e.g. Fr. *le père*. Similarly (*i*)*ste*, attested by Ital. *stasera*, 'this evening,' etc., is actually found in Old MSS.; and *istē* is mentioned as a barbarism by Marius Plotius Sacerdos (p. 451 K.).

VII. Other Enclitics, or rather Sentence Enclitics, are:—

(1). The Substantive Verb.

The forms assumed by *est*, *erat*, etc., in the Romance languages show them to have been unaccented words; and the way of writing *es*, *est*, in the best MSS. of Plautus, *amatus* (*amatu's*), *amatus*, *amatast*, *amatus*, shows that they were treated as enclitic appendages of the Past Participle Passive. Klotz is probably right in denying that *iuratus* (*sum*) at the beginning of a Trochaic Tetrameter, Rud. 1373, is a violation of the law which forbids a conflict between natural and metrical accent in words of this kind in the odd feet of Trochaic lines. The unusual metrical accentuation of final *-us* is probably to be justified by the enclitic nature of *sum*. But he is wrong if he supposes this to be the normal accentuation of such phrases in Plautus' verses. In the time of Plautus final *-s* after a short vowel hardly constituted 'position' before an initial consonant; and the accentuation which we should expect at that date, *iurātū'sum* (like *iurāntium*), *tristī'sim* (like *tristium*), is at least thrice as common in the lines of Plautus as the other. We have e.g. *salvūs sum* in Cas. 312, Rud. 442, Bacch. 772; *salvūs sis* Poen. 751, 858. Stich. 316; but *salvus sum* Amph. 331, 581, Curc. 610, Merc. 381, 603, Mil. 1343, Most. 566, Pseud. 973, Rud. 1394, Truc. 707; *salvus sis* Bacch. 456, 536, Epid. 549, Men. 910,

Pers. 579, Rud. 104, 139. The short quantity of the middle syllable is established by such endings of Trochaic Tetrameters as *nūllūs sum*, Merc. 217, or of Iambic Senarii as *visūs sum*, Merc. 232, 245. On the other hand when the syllable preceding the substantive verb, *sum*, *sim*, etc., is long by nature or by position, the metrical ictus usually falls upon it, e.g. *misēr sum*, Capt. 993, 994, Pseud. 13, 80, 299: *salvāe sunt* Rud. 168, *acceptūm sit* Truc. 894, *paupēr sum*, Aul. 88, *auctōr sum* Aul. 251, *victōr sum* Pseud. 1036. These remarks apply equally to the versification of Terence.

Disyllabic forms of the Substantive Verb, following a Past Participle Passive etc., occur generally at the end of a line or hemistich. The metrical ictus falls on the syllable which would, if the Substantive Verb were enclitic, bear the natural accent, e.g. Men. 654 *dēfessi sumus*, Merc. 481 *oblītūs fui*, Aul. 229 *cōiunctūs siem*, Mil. 170 *optandūm foret*. Although the necessities of metre at the end of a line make it impossible that the ordinary accentuation could be followed so successfully there as at other parts of the verse, I see no reason for doubting that in these endings at least there was no conflict between metrical ictus and the pronunciation of common life.

Before leaving the Substantive Verb it is perhaps worth mentioning that the common phrase 'what is the matter?' shows, according to Studemund, only two accentuations in Plautus—*quid negoti'st?* and *quid est negoti?* but not *quid est negoti'st?* The second may possibly be distinguished from the first by its impatient tone, like our 'what is the matter?'

(2). The monosyllabic Substantive *res*.

The frequency of the accentuation *in rem*, *ab re*, *proptēr res*, *qu(am)ōbrem*, *hāc re* in Plautus suggests that the word *res* may have been, at least in some phrases, an Enclitic. If this be the case the order of the words in Trin. 682, where the MSS. give *mē qui abusus sūm tantam rem*, need not be altered with Ritschl to *mē qui tantam abusus sum rem*, to avoid the conflict between natural and metrical accent in the odd foot of a Trochaic line. In the phrase *ei rei operam dare* the two first words are always monosyllables in Plautus, with the metrical accent normally on *ei*. All these facts point to an enclitic use of *res* like that of the word 'thing' in 'nothing,' 'something.' But this theory is not mentioned by any of the Latin Grammarians, and is based solely on the versification of the Comedians.

VIII. On the other hand we are indebted

to the Grammarians for the knowledge of a law of Latin Accentuation which we should hardly have discovered from other sources, viz. that in contracted Vocatives and Genitives of *io*-Stems the Accent of the uncontracted form is retained, e.g. *Vergili*, *Valéri*, *tugúri*. (Serv. ad Aen. I. 451: Priscian VII. 18, p. 301.) There is no reason to doubt that this was the usage of Plautus, though it is hardly possible to get proofs of it in his versification. We never find e.g. *consili* in his plays, though indeed such a form could only occur in the few places where a dactyl word is allowed, and perhaps even there the shortening of the final *-i* (standing for *-ii*) was felt not to be permissible. *Benefici* reflects a common accentuation of Nominative *bénéficium*, just as *cónsili* reflects *cónsilium*, an accentuation which alternates with *consilium*. In Pseud. 1210:

*Hárpax* ego vocór: ego servos súm *Macedonís* *mílitis*,

the accentuation of the second last word is suspicious, for in Plautus words of the form of a Proceleusmatic or fourth Paeon have, as we shall see, the accent invariably, or almost invariably, on the first syllable, e.g. *Mil. 44 triginta Sardi, sexaginta Macedones*. Elsewhere in the *Pseudolus*, the phrase is invariably not *miles Macedo*, but *miles Macedonius*; and seeing that Studemund in his Apograph of the Ambrosian Codex declares himself uncertain whether its reading in this passage is *Macedonis* or *Macedonii*, we are perhaps justified in rejecting the reading of the Palatine MSS. in favour of *Macedoni*, the Gen. of *Macedonius*, which would naturally be spelt *Macedonii* in the MSS. The apparently abnormal accentuation *Macédoni* will be explained by the fact that the contracted form retains the (Plautine) accentuation of the full form *Macédonii*, just as *Vergili*, according to Priscian, retains that of *Vergílii*.

IX. Words like *Vergíli* are, like *Arpínás*, *íllíc*, and the other words which we discussed before, only apparent departures from the ordinary rule of accentuating the penult if it be long, and, if it be short, the antepenultimate syllable. The Grammarians mention one or two more decided examples of the kind. Thus Servius (ad Aen. VI. 743) tells us that *évinde* was accented on the third syllable from the end, though the penult is long by position; and Priscian (XV. 9, p. 67) says the same also of *déinde*, *súbinde*, *périnde*. That this was also Plautus' usage is made probable by Stich. 520:

*út quoique homini rés paratást périnde amicis*  
*utitur,*

where *périnde* is not only the reading of both the Ambrosian and the Palatine MSS., but is expressly attested by Charisius, who quotes this very line. The scansion *périnde* seems to imply that in ordinary pronunciation the second syllable was unaccented.

X. Interjections also are excluded by the Grammarians from the ordinary rule. They are said to have no 'certi accentus,' whatever that may mean; and the statement of a late Grammarian (Audacius [Audax] apud Bedam de metr. p. 2363 P) that *papáé* and *attát* were accented on the last syllable is confirmed, in the case of at least the former, by the metrical accentuation of Plautus. They tell us too that, where a Greek word in a Latin author retained its Greek form and declension, it should retain its Greek accent, so that for example *Epiros* in Virg. Georg. I. 59 was to be pronounced in reading, *Epiros*. (Servius ad loc.)

XI. But more important deviations from the Latin Accent laws are found in Early Latin and in Vulgar Latin. It was the merit of Corssen to establish by clear proof the existence of an older Accent Law in Latin by which in early Latin, as in the Teutonic and Celtic languages, the Accent fell on the first syllable of each word. Long words like *potestatibus* would no doubt have, beside the main accent on the first syllable, a secondary accent on a syllable nearer the end, perhaps *pótestatibus*, *lánificium*, *bénéficium*, so that the change from the old to the new Accentuation may have been in the main a usurpation by the secondary accent of the importance of the primary accent. This change was no doubt a gradual one, but the precise period to which it should be assigned has not yet been discovered. It is a striking fact, but a fact about which there can hardly be any doubt, that the accentuation of quadrisyllables with the first three syllables short was in Plautus' time on the first syllable, and not, as in the time of Quintilian, on the second. Examples of such quadrisyllables, — *facilius*, *miseria*, *meminero*, — with the metrical ictus on the second syllable are so rare in Plautus, and perhaps also in Terence, that their occurrence in a line gives suspicion that the reading is corrupt or that the line is a later addition or alteration.

A single case of exceptional spelling on an inscription is not evidence of great weight; but it is worth noticing that in an inscription (C.I.L. I. 1016) which can hardly be earlier than Plautus' time, we find OPI-

TVMA, the accentuation of which the later form *optuma* shows us to have been *ôpituma*, just as the trisyllabic *balineae* shows that the pronunciation of the Plautine *balineae* must have corresponded with the metrical accentuation which it has always in his plays (with one doubtful exception, Poen. 976), *bâlineae*, or as the metrical accentuation *puéritia* Ter. Heaut. 183 (the only instance of the word in Plaut. or Ter.) is shown by Horace's *puertia* to have been also its natural accentuation. Whether this particular class of words with fourth last syllable accented is to be regarded as a mere freak of usage, or whether it is a proof that the earlier accentuation had not in Plautus' time entirely yielded to the three-syllable Law is difficult to say with certainty. We might expect to find some traces of it in some of the Romance languages, the languages namely of those provinces which were conquered before or at the time of Plautus and Terence, but Romance scholars have not as yet mentioned any instance of the kind except the word *trifolium*, 'trefoil.' The forms assumed by that word in Span. *trébol*, Catalanian *trébol*, Portuguese *trêvo*, point to an early Vulgar Latin *\*trifolium*, whereas Ital. *trifoglio* requires *trifolium*. But Gröber refers the forms assumed by the word on the Spanish Peninsula to the influence of the Greek *τρίφυλλον*, so that the argument from *trifolium* is at best a doubtful one. On the other hand the Latin of Plautus is by no means the same as Vulgar Latin, and the absence of this particular accentuation from the latter cannot disprove its existence in the former.

XII. Other examples of deviation from the three-syllable Law in Plautus are isolated words, such as *sâtellites* (?), *sâgitta* (?), where the accent is probably that of the language from which the words were borrowed, just as *Philippus* shows the Greek accentuation, *Φίλιππος*, and *fenestra* (or *festra*: so Paul. Fest. 64 de Ponor), the precise relation of which to the later *fenestra* is not clear. *Áu(o)nculus* is perhaps nothing but an instance of the common law that words of constant use in daily and familiar intercourse tend to become smoothed away to a reduced shape. *Consobrinus* has similarly dwindled in the Romance languages to Fr. cousin, Catal. *cosí*, Ital. *cugino*, while *mea domina* becomes in Ital. *madonna*, and *ma dame* in English 'ma'am.'

XIII. The Romance languages furnish us with more deviations from the classical Accent Law:

(1). First of all they show us that in

Vulgar Latin the accent must have shifted from the third last to the second last syllable in the words ending in *-iētem*, *-iōlum*, *-iērem*. Thus Vulgar Latin *mulierem* is shown by its Romance forms to have been pronounced *mulîerem*, Span. *mujer*, Prov. *molher*, Roum. *muier*, etc.; and this is confirmed by the precept of a late Grammarian (Anecd. Hel. CIII.): 'mulierem' in antepaenultimo nemo debet acuerē sed in paenultimo potius, as well as by the scansion in Christian poets of the third and fourth centuries *mulîere*. In Plautus, whose Latin, as we have said, is not by any means the same as Vulgar Latin, there is no trace of this usage. *Pârietem* and *hâriolum* have with him the same metrical accentuation as *fâcilius* (viz. *pârietem*, *hâriolum*); *filiolum* as *môbilius* (viz. *filiolum* or *filiolum*).<sup>1</sup>

(2). Again the occurrence of a Mute with the Liquid *r* at the beginning of the last syllable seems to have attracted the accent to the penult. Thus Vulgar Latin *tenêbrae* is attested by Span. *tinieblas*, and other Romance forms. We cannot be wrong in connecting this with the practice of Latin poets of treating a short syllable before a Mute with *r* as a long syllable, when it suits their convenience, a practice unknown in the early Drama. Servius (ad Aen. I. 384) seems to say that the accent was not in his time attracted to the penult in ordinary pronunciation; for he remarks with regard to *peragro* in this line of Virgil; 'per' habet accentum...muta enim et liquida quotiens ponuntur metrum iuvant non accentum.

(3). In compound Verbs the Accent seems to have shifted to the stem-vowel of the Verb in Vulgar Latin, e.g. *recipit* is indicated by Ital. *riceve*, Fr. *reçoit*; *demorat* by Ital. *dimora*, Fr. *demeure*. With this we may connect the tendency in the spelling of post-classical Inscriptions and of our earliest MSS. to restore the Vowels in Compound Verbs to their undecayed form, e.g. *consacro*, *compremo*.

(4). Lastly we see from the Romance forms of the Numerals that the Vulgar Latin accentuation of the tens must have been *vîginti*, *quadrâginta* (Ital. *quaranta*). *Triginta* is one of the barbarisms, 'quae in usu cotidie loquentium animadvertere possumus,' enumerated by a fifth century Grammarian, Consentius (p. 391 K.). In Plautus *quadrâgintâ* is indeed the invariable metrical accentuation,<sup>2</sup> but this proves no-

<sup>1</sup> See my paper in Wölfflin's *Archiv*, 1891.

<sup>2</sup> In Trin. 420 the Ambrosian Palimpsest reads: *minâs quadrâginta accepistinc a Câllicle* but the Palatine MSS. have *quadrâginta accepisti*.

thing about the ordinary pronunciation of the word in his time, for the prosodical nature of the word does not allow of a metrical accentuation *quadraginta*, unless we allow (what seems very doubtful) that a syllable *long by nature* might be metrically shortened in a polysyllable. The numeral 'four hundred' appears as *quadringenti*, showing the legitimate metrical shortening of a syllable *long by position*, or (as editors usually print it) *quadrigenti*, the older form, of which *quadringenti* is a later debased form, due to the false analogy of numerals like *septingenti*. *Viginti* and *triginta* are common enough in the verses of Plautus, but it is almost always in the phrases *viginti (triginta) minae*, or sometimes *viginti (triginta) dies* that the words have this accentuation. In other cases the metrical ictus falls normally on the second syllable *viginti*, *triginta*, which we must suppose to have been the actual pronunciation of Plautus' time, while the phrases *viginti minae*, *triginta dies* were really compounds like 'twopence,' 'fortnight,' and took the accent on the antepenultima of the compound word *vigintiminæ*, *trigintadies*, like *octodecim*, *novemdecim*. The metrical accentuation *viginti*, *triginta* is so invariable in Plautus and Terence, unless *minæ*, or *dies*, follows, that one is tempted to question the reading of the few lines which furnish exceptions. They are:

Asin. 364 *nū hodie Argyrippo viginti essent argenti minæ*.

Here the MSS. have *essent viginti*, and Fleckeisen is probably right in reading *argenti essent viginti minæ*.

Bacch. 6. *qui viginti annis errans a patria afuit*.

The MSS. have *annis viginti*, which we may retain if we change *errans* into *aberrans*, and so aid the alliteration.

Cist. II. 3. 19 *unde tibi talenta magna viginti, pater?*

In Rud. 1382 the MSS. have:

*quinque et viginti natus annos. Habe cum hoc. Aliost opus,*

but the MSS. of Priscian, who quotes the passage, have *annos natus*. Schoell retains the *natus annos* of the MSS. of Plautus and accents *viginti*, but Fleckeisen adopts Priscian's *annos natus* with *viginti*.

Merc. 432 *tris minas accūdere etiam possum ut triginta sient*

perhaps does not require alteration, though one might remove *minas* from the first to the last part of the line; for the accentuation *triginta minæ* will excuse the two iambic words at the end of the line, *ut triginta minæ sient*.

In Lucilius XXVII. 27 M. (ap. Nonium 88 M.),

*viginti domi an triginta an (MSS vel) centum cibicidās alas,*

the harshness of *viginti* in the first foot of a Trochaic Tetrameter would be softened by retaining *vel* of the MSS. and reading the line:

*viginti an triginta domi vel centum cibicidās alas.*

Of the other numerals, *quinquaginta*, *sexaginta*, *octoginta* are the prevailing accentuations in the verses of Plautus.

W. M. LINDSAY.

#### APPARATUS CRITICUS AD CICERONIS LIBROS DE NATURA DEORUM.

III § 30. § 30. 23 omnes *A<sup>1</sup>B<sup>1</sup>PV<sup>1</sup>* || cereum, eu in ras. 2, *A* cereum c. praeced. esset in ras. *V<sup>2</sup>* certum *B<sup>1</sup>MP* || 29 commutari potest *B<sup>1</sup>* || 31 cuncta *A<sup>1</sup>* || potest esse *P* || 33 corpi mutab. *B<sup>1</sup>* || ac si *B<sup>1</sup>* (ad si *A*) || esset omne aliqu. *M<sup>1</sup>* || 1 muta\*bi\*le, praeter le in ras. 1, *B* || 3 id om. *P* || ex his concretum est aut ex *P* his etiam *A<sup>2</sup>B<sup>2</sup>F<sup>2</sup>M<sup>2</sup>K* || earum horum (orum *B<sup>1</sup>*) *B<sup>1</sup>F<sup>1</sup>K* || 4 quin] qui *C* qui non ut vid. *V<sup>1</sup>* || § 31, 4 et humor ita mollis est *CV<sup>3</sup>* et humor (humori *K*) ita molle est (mollest *A<sup>1</sup>* molest *B<sup>1</sup>* molē *V<sup>1</sup>*) *AB<sup>1</sup>F<sup>1</sup>M<sup>1</sup>V<sup>1</sup>K* et ita molle est humor *P* || 5 prami *A<sup>1</sup>* (praemi *A<sup>2</sup>BC<sup>2</sup>F<sup>2</sup>M<sup>2</sup>*) comprimi *P* || 6 maxime] om. *A<sup>1</sup>* maxumae *A<sup>2</sup>* maximae *B<sup>1</sup>* maxime *B<sup>2</sup>C<sup>2</sup>F<sup>2</sup>M<sup>2</sup>P<sup>2</sup>K* || dissipabilis *BC<sup>2</sup>F<sup>2</sup>M<sup>2</sup>P<sup>2</sup>K* || 8 et ex aqua, om. cum, *B<sup>1</sup>* || 9 ex aere] et ex

aer *C<sup>1</sup>* et ex aere *C<sup>2</sup>* || 10 intereant...constet *ZK* || § 32, 11 ommitamus *AB<sup>1</sup>* omittit. *CM* omittamus *B<sup>2</sup>* || inuenire *B<sup>2</sup>F<sup>2</sup>K* || 14 nec] non *M<sup>1</sup>* || ullo sensu—uoluptatis sen. om. *B<sup>1</sup>* (iocunda *AB<sup>2</sup>C<sup>2</sup>F<sup>2</sup>M<sup>2</sup>V<sup>2</sup>K*) || nullo *V<sup>2</sup>* || 15 caput dol. *B<sup>1</sup>* || 17 esse animal mortale, animal del. 1, *C* || mortalem *B<sup>1</sup>* || § 33, 17 quid est] quidem *CF<sup>1</sup>K* (quit est *B<sup>1</sup>*) || 19 ad illa *V<sup>1</sup>* || et quod ea sentiat *AB<sup>2</sup>F<sup>2</sup>M<sup>2</sup>P<sup>2</sup>V<sup>2</sup>K* (sentit err. typogr.) om. *C* || 21 non om. *M<sup>1</sup>* || 22 secundum in ras. min. *A<sup>2</sup>* || 23 fusi *B<sup>1</sup>* || 24 est et—contra naturam om. *B<sup>1</sup>* est et quod contra naturam est *B<sup>2</sup>F<sup>2</sup>K* || 25 interemendi *B<sup>1</sup>V<sup>1</sup>* interim., sed sec. i in ras. ampl. 3, *A* (inter\*\*emendi *A<sup>1</sup>*) || § 34, 26 innumerabilia sunt om. *B<sup>1</sup>* || 27 qui in id *B<sup>1</sup>* || intereat] *V<sup>1</sup>* add. *V<sup>2-3</sup>* al. necesse est, quae



*rursus deleta sunt* (interaeat *A*) || etenim *om. V* || 28 ut uoluptas ut dolor || *A*<sup>3</sup>*B*<sup>2</sup>*C**F**K* *om. B*<sup>1</sup> uoluptas ut dolor (*om. pr. ut*) *A*<sup>1</sup>*M**V* uoluptas, *om. rell.*, *P* || 29 interimunt, *supra* u *scr. fuit* a *sed eras.*, *V* intereunt *P* || est aeternum *C* || 30 aut || *A*<sup>3</sup> (*supra ras.*) et *C*<sup>2</sup>*F*<sup>2</sup>*M* ut *A*<sup>1</sup>(?)*B*<sup>1</sup>*F*<sup>1</sup>*P**V**K* || *terrena*] aeterna (?) *C*<sup>1</sup> *terra* *C*<sup>3</sup> (*terraena* *A*) || 33 habeat, *post. a spscr.*, *A* || quod *B*<sup>1</sup> || ui (ut *V*<sup>1</sup>) efferatur *ABCFMVK* efferatur ui *P* (*natura* cui eff. *B*<sup>1</sup>) || 1 quoddam] cotam *B*<sup>1</sup> || quohaerere *A*<sup>1</sup> quohere. *A*<sup>2</sup> coerere *B*<sup>1</sup> coh|rere *M*<sup>1</sup> coher. *C*<sup>1</sup>*V*<sup>1</sup>*K* || 2 necessesse, *sec. s spscr. I*, *A* || quaeque] quae *A*<sup>1</sup> (queque *F*<sup>1</sup>) || 3 naturapiatur *B*<sup>1</sup> || animale est *B*<sup>1</sup> || § 35, 4 eraditum *B*<sup>1</sup>*F*<sup>1</sup> eracl. *B*<sup>2</sup>*F*<sup>2</sup> || 5 qui quoniam] *V*<sup>2</sup> quoniam, *om.* qui, *ABCFMP* quoniam] quoniam ut *vid. V*<sup>1</sup> || 6 qui id *A*<sup>3</sup> || diceret quod intellegi (intelligi *A*<sup>1</sup>*V*<sup>1</sup>) *Z*, *sed* quod *del. V*<sup>2</sup> || omittam *B*<sup>1</sup> omittamus *C* || omne uim *C*<sup>1</sup> omnium *V*<sup>2</sup> *e corr.* (*V*<sup>1</sup> *obsc.*) omnem uim *V*<sup>3</sup> in *mg.* || 7 ignem *Z* || animantes *C* || 8 uiuere\* *A* (*sequ. i in ras. 2*) uidere (?) *F*<sup>1</sup> || id uigere in *ras. I* *V* id uisere *B*<sup>1</sup> id uiuere, *ge m. 2-3*, *F* || 9 comodo *V*<sup>1</sup> || corpore *C*<sup>1</sup> || § 36, 12 uultus (?) *B*<sup>1</sup> (uultis *A*<sup>3</sup>*C*<sup>1</sup>*F*<sup>1</sup>*M*<sup>1</sup>*P*<sup>1</sup>*V*<sup>1</sup>) || animal (anima *A*<sup>1</sup> ?) extrinsecus *Z* || 14 animantem *A*<sup>1</sup> animantum *M* || animal] anima *Z* || 15 ho *A*<sup>1</sup>*V*<sup>1</sup> *corr. A*<sup>3</sup>*V*<sup>2</sup> (hoc uel homo *A*<sup>2</sup> in *mg.*, quae *del. A*<sup>3</sup>) || nisi ignem—esse animum *om. V*<sup>1</sup> *suppl. V*<sup>2</sup> || 16 inprobabilis *B*<sup>1</sup> || enim] autem *P* || quoddam *C* || 17 temperatum, *te in ras. ampl. 2*, *C* || quod si—sese animal—alia *bis scr., utrobique om.* ipse, *sed pr. del. C* || animal] anima *B*<sup>1</sup> || nulla se] nulla esse *B*<sup>1</sup> (*fort. corr. I*) || 18 quoniam his cum *B*<sup>1</sup>*F*<sup>1</sup>*V*<sup>1</sup> quoniam cum is cum *C* || in *om. M* || 19 russus *B*<sup>1</sup> rursum *C* || 20 quod quid *C* (quicquid *B*<sup>2</sup>*F*<sup>2</sup>*M*<sup>1</sup>*P*<sup>1</sup>*V*<sup>1</sup>) || habeat, *post. a spscr.*, *A* || sentia *A*<sup>1</sup> || 21 ad ante eundem *om. B*<sup>1</sup> || 22 quidem *om. B*<sup>1</sup> || § 37, 23 iisdem *V*<sup>3</sup> || pastus, *sed post. s eras.*, *C* || 24 alatur, at *corr. 2* *ex itt. V* || alii] alii *B*<sup>1</sup>*F*<sup>1</sup>*M* alia *C* || 25 aquis *corr. ex aquas A* || aquis (t ?) *B* || alii dulcibus *C* dulcibus, *om. alia, M* || alia marinis, *sec. a in ras. 2*, *C* || 26 quur *AC* || progredditur *C*<sup>1</sup> || solistitiali *AB*<sup>1</sup>*V*<sup>1</sup> solistic. *P* || urbe *B*<sup>1</sup> orbe *B*<sup>2</sup>*F*<sup>2</sup>*M* || 27 itemque] neque *C* || nec *M*<sup>1</sup> || 29 naturae (*pr. loco*) *V*<sup>1</sup> || ignem (n) *A* || § 38, 31 autem, u *spscr.*, *A* || nos] *A*<sup>1</sup> uel non in *mg. A*<sup>2</sup> non *B*<sup>1</sup>*V* || 33 conscientia *M* (*sciencia A*) || 34 nihil esse *V*<sup>2</sup> || delectu *B*<sup>2</sup>*C*<sup>2</sup>*F*<sup>2</sup>*M*<sup>2</sup>*V*<sup>2</sup>*K* || 35 quid autem intelligitia, *sed autem del. I*, *A* (intellig. etiam *F*<sup>1</sup>) || 1 at, t in *ras. 2*, *AM* (ad *B*<sup>1</sup>) || opsecrum *AB*<sup>1</sup> || 3 sotiatiat *A*<sup>1</sup> sotiatiat *A*<sup>2</sup> || communita *B*<sup>1</sup> || 4 corpori *B*<sup>1</sup> corporibus *C* || 5 si *corr. ex se ut vid. A om. B*<sup>1</sup> || intellegi qui] intellegui *A*<sup>1</sup> intellegi, *om. qui, C* (intelligi qui *V*<sup>1</sup>) || 6 potest dolore an in periculo an in dolore, *om. an in labore, P* || dolore in, *om. an, C* || labore in *ras. F*<sup>2</sup> || § 39, 7 utentem, u *corr. 2*, *A* || 8

possimus *M* || inscitam *AB*<sup>1</sup>*V*<sup>1</sup> insitiam *C* || § III § 39. dispicere *C*<sup>1</sup> || dicitur *A*<sup>1</sup>*V*<sup>1</sup> || stoicus *A*<sup>1</sup> || sunt in *ras. B*<sup>2</sup> || 10 omnes *B*<sup>1</sup> (*corr. rec.*) et *F*<sup>1</sup> || 12 alabandum alabandi *Z* || tenendi, *post. n spscr.*, *A* tenen\*\* *B*<sup>1</sup> tenedi *B*<sup>2</sup>*C*<sup>1</sup>*F*<sup>1</sup>*M*<sup>1</sup>*P*<sup>1</sup>*V*<sup>1</sup> || tenen *B*<sup>1</sup>*C* || 13 inoo *B*<sup>2</sup> (*in ras.*) et *F* || asclepium *C*<sup>1</sup> || 14 Tyndaridas *om. F* (*tind. C*) || nostrum *Z* || complures *CPV* || et *bis scr. C* || 15 adscripticos *B*<sup>1</sup> (adscriptitios *AB*<sup>2</sup>*F*<sup>2</sup>*M* ascriptitios *C* ascriptitios *V*) || recepto *A*<sup>1</sup> || § 40, 16 qui duos philosophi *A* qui philosophi duos *P* (*phyl. FV*<sup>2</sup>) || qui] quid *C*<sup>1</sup> || 17 mundus deus ipse *P* || 18 sublime *Z* || esse candens *P* || inuocans *A*<sup>1</sup> || omnis *corr. ex omnes C* || 19 plures *A*<sup>2</sup>*P* || quanto *A*<sup>1</sup>*M*<sup>1</sup> || eorum est *M* eorum sit *P* || 20 singulas, n in *ras. 2*, *A* || numeras *corr. ex numeros A* numeris *M* || 21 easque *P* (eosque *B*<sup>1</sup>) || aut] ut *C*<sup>1</sup> || belluarum *B*<sup>1</sup> *om. C*<sup>1</sup> || appelles *C*<sup>1</sup> || nepam] lupam *Z* || 22 inanimatarum *B*<sup>3</sup>*P*<sup>1</sup>*V*<sup>2</sup> animarum *C* || § 41, 25 sermonis, i in *ras. 3*, *A* sermones *B*<sup>1</sup>*V*<sup>1</sup> sermone *V*<sup>2</sup> || haecquem *AB*<sup>2</sup>*F*<sup>2</sup>*V* haecquaem *C*<sup>2</sup> hecquem *P* haec quem *B*<sup>1</sup> haec quae in *C*<sup>1</sup> inter haec quem (quaem *M*<sup>1</sup>) *F*<sup>2</sup>*M* || 26 putamus *C* || 27 peruenisse dicimus deos *P* || deos, d *spscr.*, *C* || redde *V*<sup>2</sup> || 28 id] idem *AC* et in *mg. V*<sup>3</sup> || sieri potuerit *B*<sup>1</sup> || 29 co pacto *B*<sup>1</sup> || 30 monte moetaeo (montem oeta eo) *AMPV* montemetaeo *B*<sup>2</sup>*F* montem etae *B*<sup>1</sup> monte oeta eo *C* || (inlatae] *CF*<sup>2</sup>*P* inlate *A*<sup>1</sup>*B*<sup>1</sup>*F*<sup>1</sup>*V*<sup>1</sup> illate *A*<sup>2</sup> illatae *M*<sup>2</sup>*V*<sup>2</sup>) || fuerint *Z* || aceius *C* acutius *V*<sup>1</sup> actius *V*<sup>2</sup> || 31 quem, em *corr. 2*, *V* || 32 excesserat *A*<sup>1</sup>*P*<sup>1</sup>*V*<sup>1</sup> *corr. A*<sup>3</sup>*V*<sup>3</sup> || uita (*in ras. V*<sup>3</sup>; ta in *ras. A*<sup>3</sup>) quamquam *AV* uita quamquam *BCF*, *sed in B* uita in *ras. 2* et n *spscr. 2*; uix aquam. quam *P* || § 42, 33 quem, e in *ras. 3*, *V* || potissimum *A*<sup>1</sup> || 34 plures *A*<sup>3</sup>*P*<sup>1</sup>*V*<sup>3</sup> || hii *ABF*<sup>1</sup>*M*<sup>1</sup>*V* hi *P* || 1 iouem natum *BF* || ite ioue *C*<sup>1</sup> item quod ioue *A*<sup>3</sup> || antiquissimo item ioue *P* || iouis *A*<sup>1</sup>*BF**MPV* || 2 plures *A*<sup>2</sup>*CV*<sup>3</sup> || grecum *C* (grecorum *FMPV*<sup>1</sup>) || 3 lysito *ACMP* lysitho *B* (*sed h spscr. I*) et *F* lisito *V* || est is in *ras. B*<sup>2</sup> est his *F*<sup>1</sup> || herculis *AB*<sup>1</sup>*P*<sup>1</sup>*V*<sup>1</sup> || appolline *M* || 4 accipimus *V*<sup>1</sup> || aiunt *om. C* || (frygiat *ABF* frig. *CMPV*) || 5 exida] is ut *vid. A*<sup>1</sup> (exideis *C*<sup>2</sup>*MP*) || digitis *C*<sup>2</sup> || 6 quartus] cui quartus *Z* || est et] est *Z* || tyri\* (*a vel ae*) *B* || colitur *Z* (*err. typ. ed.*) || 7 carthagenem *AB*<sup>1</sup>*P* cartagin. *B*<sup>2</sup>*F* cartagin. *CV* chartagin. *M* || quiintus *B*<sup>1</sup> || inmdia *A*<sup>1</sup> india, *om. in, C* in inuidia, *sed ui del. I*, *F* || bellus *B*<sup>1</sup> || 8 sexus *B*<sup>1</sup> || hic qui ex *BF*<sup>1</sup> hic et *C*<sup>1</sup> || tertius] septimus *C*<sup>1</sup> artius *V*<sup>1</sup> (tercius *BM*) || 9 plures *CPV*<sup>2</sup><sup>3</sup> || iouis *V* || accipimus *ABF*<sup>1</sup>*M*<sup>1</sup>*P*<sup>1</sup>*V*<sup>1</sup> || § 43, 10 quando *AV*<sup>1</sup> || dicebo *B*<sup>1</sup> || 11 dedicisse *A* || pontificio, ci *corr. ex cl, A* || 12 pecdunculis *C* || his *BF*<sup>1</sup> *om. ACPV* || 13 quam] quam refer sit *C*<sup>2</sup> || 14 sequar *corr. I* (?) *ex* sequor *A* || dic, c e *corr.*, *A* || respondeam, pon in *ras. min. 2-3*, de *spscr. I* ut *vid.*, *A* || 15 nymfae dae *A*<sup>1</sup>

III § 43. nymphae de  $V^1$  nymphedae  $B^1$  nymfae deae  $A^2M$  || (synymphae  $A$  si nymphae  $B^1$  si nymphae  $C$  si nymphae  $MP$  si nymphae  $V$ ) || pani sunt etiam corr.  $B$  ex panisciastiam  $A$  panes etiam  $C$  || et om.  $V$  || hii  $C$  hy  $V$  || 16 nymphae (-phe  $B$  -fae  $CV$ ) deae (dea  $B^1$ ) quidem (quidest  $C^1$ )  $Z$  || 17 nec ceteri  $BF$  nec caeteri  $M$  || ergo om.  $P$  || corum  $B^1$  || 18 Age || ege  $B^1$  || ergo || orgo  $B^1$  || ortus  $B^1F^1$  || 19 qui—dicuntur || qui fluunt apud inferos  $P$  || acheton  $C^1$  achero, h  $spscr.$  1,  $F$  accaron  $P$  || 20 pirislegethon  $B^1$  pyriflegethon  $M$  (pyriflegethon  $AV$  piriflegethon  $B^2F$  piriflegethon  $C$  pyriflegeton  $P$ ) || caron  $P$  || dii sunt putandi  $C$  (dii put.  $BFM^2V^2$ ) || § 44, 20 At id || at ut  $C^1$  at uel  $C^2$  (ad id  $A^1B^1V^1$ ) || 21 dicit  $C$  || ergo haec de  $P$  || 22 haecarneades  $V$  || agebat  $ABCPV$  || 21 conuiceret  $BF$  || agebat  $V^1$  || 26 uolgi  $V^2$  (uulgo  $BCFMP$ ) || maxime, i corr.  $ex$  a,  $A$  maxim  $B^1$  || ad occidentem colunt  $P$  || 29 genealogiis  $M$  || nominatur  $C$  (sed corr. 1 -ntur) et  $M^1$  || morbus || modus  $ABCFMPV^1$  motus  $V^2$  || labor, 1 in ras. 2,  $B$  || 30 querela  $CFMP$  quaerela  $A^2$  (quaerella  $A^1BV^1$ ) || 31 rarcae  $P$  (parce  $A^1B^1C$ ) || omnes  $V^3$  || erebo || cerbero in ras. min.  $C^2$  om.  $M^1$  || § 45, 1 appoll.  $M$  || 2 dicis  $P$  || asclepio  $C^1$  esculapio  $C^2$  || 3 hii  $C$  i  $V^2$  || 4 hii dii  $C$  (hi di  $P$ ) || 5 (aristeus  $Z$ ) || apollini  $C$  || theseus qui neptuni  $A^1B^2CFPV^3$  et fort.  $V^1$  th. que nept.  $V^2$  th. que neptuni (primum vid. fuisse que, sed ex e corr. d?)  $B^1$  th. quid neptuni  $A^2M$  || 7 opinior etiam  $B^1$  etiam opinor  $F$  || enim in iure  $Z$  || s item || ita  $V^3$  || qui\* (ui?)  $B$  || deae  $A^1B^1V^1$  || 9 astypalinsae  $AP$  astypalis n se  $C$  astipalinsae  $V$  astipalinsae  $BF$  astypalinsae  $M$  || insula, corr. 1 ex insule,  $P$  || sanctissimum colunt ||  $B$  sanctissime colunt  $CM$  sanctissimum colunt  $AV^1$  (-mume col.  $V^3$ ) sanctissimum (corr. 1 ex -ssima) colunt  $P$  sanctissimum (extr. m 2) colunt  $F$  || 10 et rhesus, rhe in ras. 2,  $B$  ethesis  $A^1$  ethesus  $A^2CPV^1$  et theseus  $MV^2$  || maritimae  $C^2M$  maritum hae  $P$  (maritume, sed e in ras. ampl. 3,  $A$  maritum enupt.  $V^1$ ) || 11 hii  $C$  || § 46, 13 honoris  $ABF^1PV^1$  || non\*  $M$  || immortalitatibus corr.  $A^1(?)$  ex immortalibus, quod etiam  $B$  scribere inceperat (inmort.  $M$ ) || 14 haecatan  $C^2$  heccatem corr. ex heccatam  $M$  (haecatam  $ABC^1FV$ ) || 15 matre est asteria soror  $P$  || an in ras.  $B^2$  || 17 eumenides quaesideaesunt (sunt in ras. 1? pro est  $A$  quarum  $Z$  || adhenis  $A^1V^1$  || fanus  $A^1CV^1$  fanu  $A^2B^1$  || 18 lucis  $B^1$  locus  $C$  lucos  $P$  lucus\* (e?)  $V$  || furinae (-ne  $A^1$ ) furiae (-ie  $A^1$ )  $AB^1CPV$  furiae, om. furinae,  $B^2FM$  || 19 et scel. || esceleris  $A^1$  || § 47, 20 fana circuiimus  $B^1M$  circuiimus fana  $P$  || 21 in agris, is in ras. 2,  $C$  || ardeat irem  $A$  et sic ut vid. etiam  $B^1V^1$  ardeatino rem  $M$  || facerere  $A$  || 22 tuetur  $B^1$  || 23 memorabantur  $B^1$  commemorabantur  $P$  || honor  $BF$  (honus fides bis scr. sed 1 corr.  $V$  ||

24 (omnia quaeque cogitatione  $AB^1CM$ ) || ipsius  $Z$  || 25 fingere, n in ras. 2,  $B$  || 26 autem om.  $C^1$  || accipimus  $Z$  || 27 supra genere serapim ras. maior  $A$  || isim- in ras. ampl.  $B^2$  (-quae  $B^1$ ) || nuremus  $A^1V^1$  || 28 rerudiemus  $A^1$  || equos, e  $spscr.$ , o e corr.,  $A$  (aequos  $P$ ) || ibi  $AV^1$  ibim  $C$  ibes  $PV^2$  || 29 accipitres, res in ras. 2,  $V$  accipitros  $AB^1P$  || aspides  $C$  || crocodillos  $ABCFMV^1$  crocodrillos  $V^2$  corcodrillos  $P$  || pices  $A^1$  || faeles  $C$  (felis  $BFV^1$ ) || 2 reiciemus || explicemus,  $spscr.$  ead. m. ut uid. reiciemus,  $P$  || § 48, 2 quod  $M^1$  || dicitur  $B^2FMPV^2$  || leucothea  $ABFMV$  leuchatheia  $C$  lechothea  $P$  || 3 matuta, supra a post. ras.,  $V$  matarta  $C^1$  || dicitur  $B^1$  || sit admi  $A^1V^1$  si cadmi  $B^1F$  || pasiphe  $A^1(?)B$  (s e corr.)  $F$  pasiphaeae  $C^1$  pasiphae  $P$  || 4 et eae (aeae  $P$ ) e perside  $ACPV$  eteapersi de  $B^1$  et eae persidae  $B^2FM$  || filiae  $AV^1$  filiae  $BCFMP$  filie  $V^3$  || natae (-te  $V^1$ )  $Z$  || patres sole  $A^1$  prates (?) sole  $V^1$  purat resole  $B^1$  || numerum  $B^1$  || 5 circum  $ABCFMPV^1$  || cerciensis  $ABCPV$  cerciensis  $B^2F$  circenses  $M$  || 6 deanducis  $A^1V^1$  deam ducis  $B^1CM$  deam dicis  $PV^2$  deam dices  $A^3B^2F$  || 7 Aetia || eta (et a)  $Z$  || matri dyla  $ABCFMP$  matri dila  $V$  || absyrtio  $ACP$  absircio  $B^1$  absirtio  $B^2F^2MV^2$  absiroo  $F^1$  obsirtio  $V^1$  || egialeus  $BF$ , sed in  $F$  corr. ex -leus; aegialeus  $M$  || 9 qui\*si  $F$  || § 49, 11 trofoneus  $A^1$  triphonius  $P$  (trofonius  $A^2BFMV$ ) || boetia (-am  $C^1$ )  $Z$  || 12 immortales  $A^2CP$  (immortalis  $A^1B^1F$ ) || illos  $P$  || 13 sunt hi di ||  $BF$  sunt \*di  $A^1$  sunt ii di (dii  $C$ )  $CV^1$  sunt hi dii  $MV^2$  sunt hii di  $A^3$  hii sunt di  $P$  || eretheus  $ABCP$  erietheus  $B^2M$  erittheus  $F$  eratheus  $V$  || 15 quodro  $B^1$  || teteris  $B^1$  (caeteris  $CM$ ) || pugnanti (?)  $A^1$  || 16 libertate patriae  $P$  (patrie lib.  $C$ ) || qudem  $A$  || 17 manent  $A^1$  || § 50, 17 atqui  $B^2FP$  || 19 memoria  $C^1$  || 20 esse consecratam  $B^2$  || 21 eretheus  $ABCPV$  erietheus  $B^2FM$  || filiaeque ||  $A^3B^2FMPV^2$  filiaeque  $B^1$  iliaeque  $A^1$  illiaeque  $CV^1$  illicque  $C^2$  || 22 leonaticum  $ABCFPV$  leonatic  $M$  || leochorion  $CM$  || 23 alabandens is  $ABFM^1P$  alabandens his  $V^1$  || sanctus  $C^1$  || urb\* $s$   $B$  || 24 quos non || nos  $C$  || 25 stratoniceus  $B$  (r  $spscr.$  1) et  $F$  || molestius  $C$  || 26 solem deum, m d corr. 2,  $A$  || 1 alterum dianam  $P$  || putent  $A^1$  || 2 deae est  $A^1$  deest  $V^1$  || 3 arcui  $B^2FV^2$  arcui  $M$  arcus  $A^3M^2V^3$  || spicies  $V^1$  (spet.  $A$ ) || 4 reponantur  $P$  || et om.  $P$  || obeam speciem (spet.  $A$ ) quia causam habeat  $Z$  || 5 thaumantein  $C$  || Iris om.  $Z$  || nata, post. a in ras. 3,  $A$  || 7 quodamodo  $C$  || coloratus  $Z$  || centauro  $A^1$  || 8 retuleris in deos  $BCFPV^1$  in deos retul.  $M$  || tempestatis  $A^1$  || 10 putandi sunt  $M^2$  || 11 fructibus  $A^1MPV$  || § 52, 11 Iam || tam  $A^1(?)$   $CMV$  tum  $A^3$  || 12 gerendo, o corr. 2,  $A$  || 13 sin || in  $V$  sin in  $M^1$  || terra mater  $ACPV$  (terrā are  $B^1$ ) || 14 Fontis || fontes  $C$  || marso  $Z$

|| ex Corsica] scorsica  $B^1$  || 15 augurem  $V$  || tiberinum *corr. fort.* 1 ex tiberinum  $C$  ti-  
*corr.*  $M$  || anemonem  $ABFMPV$  et, *corr.* ex  
 anemonem,  $C^1$  uel anienem *spscr.*  $C^2$  || 16 no-  
 dium *corr.* ex nonium  $B^1$  (nodinum  $B^2$ ) || 17 in-  
 mensum, *om.* in,  $C$  (in imm.  $B^2FV$ ) || aut si  
 nichil  $C$  (aut nichil  $P$ ) || honorum  $ABF^1V^1$   
 bonorum  $P$  || recipimus  $C$  || 18 probauit  $V^1$   
 || prabandum  $A$  || § 53, 19 eos] hos  $Z$  || 22 hi  
 $BFP$  hii  $M$  || thelogi  $C$  || 23 natos *om.*  $F$  || pa-  
 tre] parte  $M^1$  || 25 carensem  $B^2$  craetensem  $B$   
 cretensem, *ult.* e *corr.* ex  $u$ ,  $M$  || 26 sepu-  
 chrum  $B$  (sepulchr.  $CFM$ ) || dioscorce  $A^1V^2$   
 et *ut vid.*  $B^1$  dioscorte  $CV^1$  dioscorde  $PV^3$   
 dioscore  $A^2M^1$  dioscorae  $B^2FM^2$  || 28 anaethes  
 $B^1C$  || anti\*quiss.  $V$  || et] ex  $C$  || 29 eubules  $C$   
 eubulaeus  $V$  || dionisys  $A$  dionisius  $BCFMV$   
 dyonisius  $P$  || 30 melampus ouiolus  $AB^2FM$   
 melampus euolus  $CPV$  meuiolus  $B^1$  || atregi  
 $A$  || 31 fili  $AB^1V^1$  || § 54, 31 primae quattuor  $B^1$   
 quatuor primae  $M$  (pr. quatuor  $P$ ) || Ioue—  
 Aoede] natae (-te  $V^1$ ) ioue altero nata etthei  
 (aethei  $AM$ ) xinoneoede  $ABFMPV$  (*sed syl-*  
*labis et litteris uario modo coniunctis ut ex. gr.*  
*none oede  $B^1$  noneoe de  $B^2$ ) nate ioue altero*  
*nate et thei (t in ras. ampl.) xinone cede  $C$  ||*  
*1 Mnemos.] nemo sine  $A$  (*sed m. 1 in ras.*) et*  
*CPV (m nemo sine  $BFM$ ) || 2 tertiae (terciae*  
 *$B^1$  tertio  $A^2$  tercio  $M$ ) ioue tertio (-cio  $BM$ )*  
*piero (-rio  $P$ ) natae (-te  $B^1C$ )  $Z$  || pieridas,*  
*pr. i *corr.* 2,  $A$  || 3 et pleris  $ABCFMV$  et proe-*  
*lias  $P$  || iisdem  $B^2F$  || et edem  $BF^1$  eodem,*  
*om. et,  $V^1$  || 4 quos  $ACPV$  || proxime  $CPV$  ||*  
*appellatum, um in ras. 3  $A$ , um in ras. 2  $F$*   
*appellatus  $V$  appellatus  $B$  || 5 quā\*multi, — m.*  
*2,  $A$  || 6 hyprione  $C^1$  || Uolcano Nili] uulca-*  
*noni  $C$  (uulcano nili  $AFMPV^3$  uolea nonili*  
 *$B^1$ ) || 7 urbem *om.*  $B^1$  || aegypti (?)  $V^1$  || elio-*  
*polis  $ACM^2V^2$  aeliopolis  $B^1$  aeliopolis  $B^2F$*   
*oliop.  $M^1$  || 8 his  $V^1$  || acantorhodi  $AB^2CFMV$*   
*acantor odi\* (e ?)  $B^1$  acantu rhodi  $P$  || 9 ialisy*  
 *$C$  || cameri tinderhodi  $ACMPV$  cameri tyn-*  
*derhodi  $BF$  || aestam  $A^1(?)BCFMPV$  ae\*lam*  
 *$A^2$  || cirtam  $B^2F$  || § 55, 10 uolcaniitem, ii ra-*  
*dendo *corr.*,  $B$  uulc. it.  $CFMV^3$  uulg. it.  $P$  || 11*  
*antiquistorici  $BF$  || 12 scundus  $C^1$  (saec.  $C^2$ ) ||*  
*in nilo  $Z$  || opas  $ABFMPV$  opos  $C$  || aegypti*  
 *$V^1$  (?) (aegyptii  $P$ ) || 13 aegyptii  $MV^1$  (egypti*  
 *$BCF$  aegypti  $P$ ) || 14 qui ter lemmi  $C^1$  || lemni*  
 \*\*\*\* fabricae  $B$  l. frabr.  $C$  (l. fabrice  $AF^1V^1$ )  
 || menalio  $C^1$  menmalio  $M$  || § 56, 16 natus dia  
 matre  $P$  || cuius *om.*  $B^1$  || 17 aliter  $V^1$  || 18 fo-  
 ronidis  $Z$ , *sed M invers. ord. for. et ualentis*  
 || filiis  $B^1$  || his  $B^1M^1V^1$  || idem] i  $M^1$  || tri-  
 fonius  $P$  (trof.  $ABCFMV$ ) || ioue] ex ioue  $P$   
 || 19 tertio] tertius  $A^1$  (tercio  $BM$ ) || mala  
 $ABFMPV$  (in  $C$  1 et i *via dinoscuntur*) ||  
 penelopam natam, *om.* pana.  $P$  pana del. 1  
 vel 2  $V$  (poenel.  $AMV$  paen.  $C$ ) || fuerunt  $C^1$   
 || 20 aegypti *ut vid.*  $V^1$  (egyptii  $BC$  egyptii  $M$

aegyptii  $P$ ) || nefans  $A^1B^1V^1$  nefanis  $M$  || ha- III § 56.  
 bet  $A^1$  nominare, are *corr.* 2-3,  $A$  || 21 fenetae  
 $V^2$  (feneatae *corr.* 1 ex foen.  $A$  fen.  $CMV^1$   
 faen.  $BF$ ) || argentum dicitur  $A^1V$  dicitur ar-  
 gentum  $P$  || aegyptum]  $B^1V^1$  egyptum  $C$  ae-  
 gypto  $A$  (*sed ut in ras. 2-3*) et  $B^2FV^2$  aegipto  
 $MP$  || 22 profugisse]  $CM$  profuisse  $AB^1PV^1$   
 praefuisse (pref.  $F$ )  $B^2FV^3$  || aegyptiis]  $A^2B^2$   
 $F^2MV^2$  (egyptiis  $C$  aegyptiis  $P$ ) aegyptus  $F^1$   
 aegyptis  $A^1V^1$  aegypti  $B^1$  || et literas *spscr.*  
 $M^2$  *om.*  $M^1$  || aegyptii]  $A^3F^2M$  (aegyptii  $P$ )  
 aegypti (eg.  $C$ )  $A^1BCF^1V$  || 23 theyn  $AB^2FM$   
 thein  $B^1P$  theyr  $CV$  || eodem nomine  $V$  || § 57,  
 1 asclepiorum  $C^1$  || 2 speculum  $MPV^3$  || obli-  
 gauisse—percussus dicitur *om.*  $F^1$  || oblega-  
 uisse  $B^1$  || 3 mercuri  $A^1BC^1V^1$  || his  $V^1$  || gyno-  
 suris  $AC$  gin.  $V^1$  cin.  $V^3$  || 4 arsipti  $C$  (arsip-  
 piae tarsinoae  $P$ ) || arsipti  $A^1$  arsipti  $M$  (ar-  
 sinoe  $A^2BCFV^1$ ) || alui—euolsionem *om.*  $C$  ||  
 aludentisque  $A^1$  audent.  $B^1$  || 5 (euuls.  $A^3FM$ -  
 $PV^3$ ) || 6 flumine, flu *in ras.* 2,  $B$  || 6 locus  $V^3$   
 || apollinem  $P$  || antiquissimis  $V^1$  || is *om.*  $M^1$   
 || 7 uulgano  $B^1$  (uulc.  $A^3B^2CFMPV^3$ ) || esse  
*om.*  $C$  || adhenarum  $B^1$  || 9 fuisse traditur, e t  
*in ras.* 3,  $A$  || ex] et  $A$  *om.*  $M$  || 10 fuerunt (?)  
 $B^1$  || 11 nomionem  $Z$  || legis  $A^1B^1PV^1$  || accipis-  
 se  $ABF$  || § 58, 12 iouis *corr.* ex iouss  $B$  ioues  
 $C^2$  || 13 nitior  $V^1$  || latonatum  $A^1V^1$  *corr.*  $A^3V^2$   
 || accipimus  $P$  || 14 tertiae pater—§ 59, 21 na-  
 tum accepimus *om.*  $C$  || tertia patre  $B^2F$  ter-  
 tia (a *in ras.*) e patre  $BM$  || matre  $BM$  (*de F*  
*nilhil notavi*) || 15 upin  $M$  || dyonysios  $A^3$  dioni-  
 sios  $M$  dyonisos  $P$  (dyonisos  $A^1$  dionisos  $BF$   
 dyonysos  $V$ ) || 16 proserpinatum  $A^1V^1$  || nysan  
 $A^1$  (nisan  $B^1MV$ ) || 17 caprio  $ABFM$  capryo  $PV$   
 || perfuisse  $V^1$  (pref.  $BF$ ) || cuius abazea  $A$   
 cuius abazaea  $BFMPV^1$  cuius ab ea  $V^3$  || 18  
 confeci  $A^1V^1$  || § 59, 20 diena nata  $A^2$  || elide  
 delubrum  $M$  elidelubrum  $APV^3$  elidulubr.  
 $V^1$  helidelubrum  $B$  (*sed h spscr.* 1) et  $F$  ||  
 uidemus  $V^1$  || 21 accipimus  $P$  || 22 tertia] ter-  
 tio  $B$  (*sed corr.* 1 ex -cio) et  $F^1$  || 23 matre  $M^1$   
 || anteneros  $A^2B^2FM$  || Syria] sitia  $V^3$  || cyro  
 que  $AB^2CFMPV$  ciroquae  $B^1$  || 25 apollonis  
 $AV^1$  || 26 salaetae  $AM$  saletae  $BCFPV^2$  salete,  
 ete *in ras.* 2,  $V^1$  || quam ioue  $V$  || 27 corufe  
 $ABCFMPV^1$  et  $V^3$  coruse  $V^2$  || oceani  $V^2$  na-  
 ta oceani  $P$  || corian  $ACFPV$  corian\* (t)  $B$   
 coriam  $M$  || 29 uigolare, g del. 1 *ut vid.*,  $B$  ||  
 pinarum  $A^1$  pen.  $A^2$  (penn.  $M$ ) || atalaria  $B^1$   
 || § 60, 31 qui idem] quidem  $Z$  || anteneros  
 $A^2B^2FM$  || 32 tertiae  $A^2$  || aliaque] *om.*  $AB^1$ -  
 $CPV^1$  et  $B^2FM$  atque  $V^2$  || 1 colecta  $A$  || 2 re-  
 ligionem  $C$  || haec refellunt  $M^1$  || 3 corsum  $B^1$   
 qursum  $F^1$  || 4 huc unde, *sed transp. sign.*  
*add.,  $C$  || § 61, 7 concordiam salutem caetera-*  
*que  $M$  || huius modi  $B$  (*sed h spscr.* 1) et  $FK$*   
*|| 8 autem enim  $A^1PV^1$  aut enis (eras. t *ut**  
**vid.*)  $B^1$  || ipsis insunt  $M$  || 9 aut] ut  $A^1$  || ho-*  
*nor  $C$  bonos  $V^1$  || 10 post. uideo *om.*  $B^1$ , del.*

III § 61. in *V*, sed restit. et spscr. 3 uel ideo || 11 in iis] *CV*<sup>2</sup> in is *V*<sup>1</sup> in his *BFMP* in hiis in *ras.* *A*<sup>3</sup> || 12 Quo in genere *om.* *F*<sup>1</sup> || 13 ab *AV*, sed b in *ras.* *A*<sup>3</sup> et *corr.* *V*<sup>2</sup> || inconstantia *A*<sup>1</sup> || § 62, 14 explicatio *A* (sed ac ut vid. in *ras.*) et *V*<sup>1</sup> explanatio *C* || 16 alia egeneris *A*<sup>1</sup>*V*<sup>1</sup> aliae generis *P* || eundem *V*<sup>1</sup> || defendis *A*<sup>1</sup>*M* || ut ii] *A*<sup>2</sup>*V*<sup>2</sup> uti (?) *A*<sup>1</sup> ut hi *BFP* ut hii *M* ut, *om.* ii, *V*<sup>1</sup> || quiqui ista *A*<sup>1</sup>*MPV*<sup>1</sup> quiquam ista *C* || 17 enodandis, *om.* in., *B*<sup>1</sup> (etiam. ur praecendens *B*<sup>2</sup> scrips. vid.) || 18 miserandum] *F*<sup>1</sup> uel

mirandum spscr. *F*<sup>2</sup> mirandum *M* || laboratus *C*<sup>1</sup> || 21 ueioue *C*<sup>1</sup> || 23 quid *A*<sup>1</sup> || 24 dictum *CM*<sup>1</sup>*P* || natarae uisus (e ut vid. *eras.*) *B*<sup>1</sup> nature uisus *F*<sup>1</sup> || est *V*<sup>1</sup> || § 63, 27 cur *om.* *B*<sup>1</sup> || quique *AB*<sup>1</sup>*CPV* || appellantur sit (n del. fort. *ead. m.*) *V*<sup>1</sup> appellati sint *V*<sup>2</sup><sup>3</sup> appellatus sit *P* || 31 pernecciosis *P* || modo *om.* *Z* || 32 contituer. *A*<sup>1</sup> || Orbonae ad *om.* *Z* || 33 esquilis] *F*<sup>2</sup>*M*, sed hic in *ras.* 1; exquilis *ABCF*<sup>1</sup>*V*, sed in *BC* iis *corr.* ex -us; exquilis *P* ||

P. SCHWENKE.

(Continuabitur.)

#### HOMERIC SCHOLIA.

*Porphyrrii Quaestionum Homericarum ad Odysseam pertinentium reliquias collegit, disposuit, edidit HERMANNUS SCHRADER.* Leipzig: Teubner. 1890. 16 Mk.

TEN years have passed since Schrader gave us the first instalment of his edition of the remains of Porphyrios, those which refer to the *Iliad*. The publication of those referring to the *Odyssey* completes a laborious and somewhat ungrateful task, carried out with the utmost thoroughness and wise judgment. The work is, to say the least of it, not likely to be popular. More perhaps than any other part of scholiastic learning the arguments of the ἐνστατικοί and λυτικοί are monuments of wasted ingenuity, often desperate inventions of cobweb difficulties for the sake of breaking through them with swords of Lilliput. The results are of more importance to the student of the human mind than to the commentator on Homer. To the former they may have a certain interest, for they were once highly esteemed, as is proved by the liberality with which they were copied into the margins of *Iliads* and *Odysseys* of all ages from the tenth century to the fifteenth. But a considerable portion of them is taken from quite respectably ancient authorities, of whom we thus learn something; it is for instance through Porphyrios that we know of Aristotle's treatment of his *Aporemata Homérica*, though it cannot be said that these add much to the philosopher's reputation. Porphyrios too has added something to our scanty knowledge of Antisthenes the Cynic.

In dealing with Porphyrios, as with other Homeric scholia, the critic finds himself in far greater difficulties with the *Odyssey* than with the *Iliad*. The Odyssean notes are not only more scanty but they are far more carelessly excerpted. Of the mass of scholia

which are in all probability Porphyrian, only forty in the *Odyssey* bear his name—just as many as occur in the first four books of the *Iliad* alone. The attribution of the majority is therefore a matter of inference, to which Schrader brings an unsurpassed knowledge of his author and of all the side-lights which can be cast upon the subject. Many of the scholia which he puts down to Porphyrios seem at first sight to be of a purely neutral and impersonal character; but it will always be found that Schrader has some good reason for his attribution. He credits Porphyrios with all scholia which are put in the form of a question; though he admits that this criterion is not quite safe, inasmuch as certain cases can be traced where this form has been given to a scholion which we know in an earlier shape as a direct statement. On the other hand it seems certain that all which were originally in the form of a question have reached us through Porphyrios; at any rate of all the other authors after him who are known to have composed Homeric problems not one can be traced among the scholia; and all those who preceded him Porphyrios seems to have included in his collection. Other notes which are not in the form of questions are given to Porphyrios because we know from other sources that he discussed them. The most important of these other sources is the single book of Porphyrios on Homeric problems which is distinct from the scholia; it is contained in the Vatican MS. No. 305, published at Rome by Lascaris in 1518, and edited by Schrader in his previous volume on the *Iliad*.

The work is accompanied by a most elaborate discussion of the chief MSS. used, of which the Harleian *Odyssey* takes the first place.

W. LEAF.



*Les Scolies Genevoises de l'Iliade, publiées avec une étude historique, descriptive et critique sur le Genevensis 44 ou Codex Ignotus d'Henri Estienne et une collation complète de ce manuscrit*, par JULES NICOLE, Professeur à la Faculté des Lettres de Genève. Paris: Hachette. 1891. 35 fres.

THIS is a work of immense toil, real acumen, and scholarly research of which Switzerland, where little has been done for Homeric study since the days of Koechly, may well be proud. For practical purposes it may be divided into two parts. One consists of pages 196-212 of Vol. I. The rest of the work forms the other.

The MS., now in the library at Geneva, was once the property of Henri Estienne, who used it in the preparation of his *Poetae Epici Graeci*, as Prof. Nicole makes plain. It dates from the thirteenth century originally, but parts have been recopied in the fourteenth. The text is closely allied to that of D, without being copied from it; a fact which has led Prof. Nicole, following the example of previous scholars, to enormously overrate the importance of the place which it can take in Homeric criticism. As a matter of fact an inspection of the variants which he gives in his collation only confirms the views which I have elsewhere expressed as to the critical worthlessness of D and all its kin. The scholia, with an important exception, are closely allied to those of B and T; but there seems some ground, as Prof. Nicole argues, for supposing them to have come from an earlier and better progenitor of these two collections, which they sometimes expand and elucidate. But it is hardly worth while to waste time in the arid regions of these exegetic scholia; the seventeen pages which are mentioned above contain far different matter, and so far outweigh in importance all the rest of the work as to deserve all the space which can be spared for them.

The scholia to book xxi., which occupy these few pages, are drawn from a rich source of Alexandrian learning. It must be said at once however that they do not add much to our knowledge of the work of Aristarchos. There are a good many scholia of Aristonikos, but these are generally identical with those in A. Here and there they give small additions or expansions; for instance the reading *ιβυκτίωνα* in 169 is

NO. XLVI. VOL. V.

ascribed to Kallistratos as well as to Zenodotos. These scholia, unlike those of A, generally have the name of Aristonikos in full at the beginning. Nikanor is entirely absent. There is very little that can be ascribed to Didymos, whose name does not occur at all. But to him is no doubt due the schol. on 452 *διχῶς ἀπέβλεψε*. This variant however cannot be right: *ἀπέβλεψε* is not admitted either by rhythm or sense as an alternative for *ἀπέπεμπε*. It is probably a corruption of *ἀπολεψέμεν*, which we know to have been read by Aristarchos in 455 in place of the vulgate *ἀποκοψέμεν*. Such a transposition and corruption would be by no means beyond the copyist's power, as will presently appear. The quotation of a new variant on 492 as being *ἐν τῇ Χίᾳ καὶ Κυπρίᾳ* also looks Didymean; and there are various other notes which may be by Didymos, so far as the evidence goes; but they lack the phrases and turns by which his work is recognised in the Venetian scholia.

Herodian on the other hand is well represented. He is quoted more at first hand than in the Venetus and his citations are often reproduced verbally. And with him are quoted also a large number of other books and authors bearing on Homer which yield the most valuable part of these excerpts. We find ourselves among a number of authors of whom nothing whatever was known before. Even in the case of those who were already known from the Venetian scholia we find our knowledge extended; sometimes they are quoted by an additional name which served to identify them in antiquity, sometimes the titles of their books are given where the Venetian epitomator was content with the bare name of the author. Thus Alexion becomes *ὁ χολός*; Komanos is *ὁ Ναυκρατίτης*. Of critics never mentioned in A we have Duris quoted twice, Phanodikos, Peisistratos of Ephesos, and another who is twice called Aridikes—a name hitherto absolutely unknown, and no doubt corrupt. A long scholion on 363 quoted from Peisistratos of Ephesos and Hermogenes *ἐν τῷ περὶ προβλημάτων* is interesting. These authors argue that the right reading is *μελδομένον* and not *μελδόμενος*, as given in the vulgate; and they explain the corruption by assuming that the original reading in the old alphabet was *μελδομενο*. But *ὁ μεταγράφων εἰς τὴν νῦν γραμματικὴν οὐκ ἐνόησεν ὅτι 'μελδομένου' ἦν*,

G G

ἀλλ' ἄνευ τοῦ ὑ ἀναγινώσκων ἀδιανόητον ἡγήτο καὶ ἡμαρτημένον εἶναι, διόπερ προσέθηκε ἀντὶ τοῦ ὑ τὸ σ, 'μελδόμενος' ποιήσας.

But to the general student these few pages contain a still more interesting peculiarity in the number of quotations given from classical authors. We have here three new lines of Alkaios, two of Sophokles, one of Euphorion, four of Xenophanes; a new Homeric ἀπόρημα by Aristotle, and a law of Solon, of which only a few words were previously known from the Lexicon of Harpokration. It must be admitted that this is a rich gleanings in so small a field; it is provoking to think how much more of the same sort we might have if a freak of fortune had not limited these extracts to a single book of the *Iliad*. As it is, Greek lexicography is enriched by at least two new words, *πρόσγονος* quoted from the *Λαριεσσαῖοι* of Sophokles in the sense of *πρόγονος*: and *κυνάπαιδες* attributed to Sophron.

Unfortunately the scholia are in many cases in a state of terrible confusion. One may suffice as a specimen; I commend it to the attention of emenders as a puzzle worth some little pains to solve, for it contains the law of Solon and a quotation from the *Δαίδαλος* of Sophokles. Prof. Nicole has given a solution which is ingenious, and at least in the main probably right; but I

withhold it in the hope that some readers of the *Classical Review* may arrive independently at even more satisfactory results. The MS. runs as follows: (282) ἐρχθέντα)... Κράτης "εἰλθέντ' ἐν μεγάλῳ" ἰαλεῖν γὰρ φησὶ εἶναι τὸ εἶργεν ὥστε τὴν τῆς κωλύσ δίκην ἐξ οὐλῆς εἰάν τις ἐξηλμάτων ἀντὶ δικανικῆς ἢ ὁ ποὶ καλεῖσθαι καὶ παρατίθεται σόλωνος ἐννεάζονι ἐξ οὐλῆς ἀνάξιον ἢ εἰς δημόσιον ὄφλανη καὶ τῷ ιδιώτῃ ἐκάτερος· ὁ σοφοκλῆς ἐν δαίδαλῳ ἑλλημενίσω τὸν δ' ἔα χαλκευτῷ πέδη.

It is perhaps only fair to would-be solvers to give them one hint; the letters ὁ ποὶ may be neglected if desirable. It is easy to see, as Prof. Nicole has pointed out, how they got into the scholion. The original of the Genevensis, like the Bankes papyrus, was in the habit of giving the name of every speaker at the beginning of his speech. When the narrative was resumed after a speech, the poet was regarded as the speaker, and a contraction of his name, ὁ ποὶ, was placed at the beginning of the line. The scholia were in this original evidently crowded into the margins, so that the copyist carelessly included these letters in what he was copying.

There are also two quite corrupt lines of Alkaios which may be set as a puzzle at some future date, if readers of the *Classical Review* care for more problems in emendation.

W. LEAF.

#### PLUMMER'S EPISTLES OF ST. JAMES AND ST. JUDE.

*The General Epistles of St. James and St. Jude*, by the Rev. ALFRED PLUMMER, D.D. (Expositor's Bible, Hodder and Stoughton. 1891.) 7s. 6d.

THIS is a book which may be commended as the product of a thoroughly cultivated mind, equally imbued with common sense, sound scholarship, and deep religious feeling. The union of these qualities is one of the most hopeful signs of the time to those who remember how often in earlier decades of the century scholarship has shown itself hard, dry, and pedantic, removed from all sympathy with life or literature; while religion appeared a mere creature of emotion, cowering under the shelter of Church authority, and suspicious of the free use of the intellect as likely to breed either heresy or atheism. In such commentaries as the present, and in those by Bishop Westcott or the much lamented Dean Plumptre, we have books addressed to the

general public which are full of instruction to scholars; and on the other hand we have learned editions of the Greek Testament, such as those by Bishop Lightfoot, which are interesting not to scholars only but to all educated readers.

In his introductory chapters Dr. Plummer discusses with much fairness the question of the authenticity of the Epistle of St. James. He comes to that which appears to me the only tenable conclusion, viz. that it was written by the president of the Church at Jerusalem, 'the brother of the Lord'; which latter phrase he interprets as meaning the son of Joseph and Mary. As to the date he considers that it could not have been written while 'the crisis as to the treatment of the Gentile converts was at its height,' but leaves it an open question whether it appeared previously to the Council at Jerusalem—say between 45 and 49 A.D.—or shortly before the author's death—say between 53

and 62. He agrees with the great majority of modern commentators in holding that there is no reference made in it to St. Paul's doctrine of Justification by Faith. As a specimen of the general tone of the notes I quote what is said on St. Jude v. 9:—

That *The Assumption of Moses* was written before our Epistle is almost universally admitted. Philippi is almost alone in thinking that its author was a Christian and that he borrowed it from St. Jude. Ewald, Dillmann, Drummond, Schürer and Wiesler place it between B.C. 4 (the year of the war of Quintilius Varus, to which it almost certainly refers) and A.D. 6. Hilgenfeld, Merx, Fritzsche and Lucius place it at different points between A.D. 44 and 70. But the earlier date is the more probable. The large fragment in Latin which we now possess was evidently made from a Greek document, and Hilgenfeld has attempted to restore the Greek from the Latin. But this Greek document may itself have been a translation from the Aramaic. In either case St. Jude would be able to read it.

That any true tradition on the subject should have 'been handed down orally through fifteen centuries without leaving the slightest trace in a single passage in the Old Testament' is utterly improbable. This hypothesis, and the still more violent supposition of a special revelation made to St. Jude, are devices prompted by a reverent spirit, but thoroughly uncritical and untenable, to avoid the unwelcome conclusion that an inspired writer has quoted legendary material. Have we any right to assume that inspiration raises a writer to the intellectual position of a critical historian with power to discriminate between legend and fact? St. Jude probably believed the story about the dispute between Michael and Satan to be true; but even if he knew it to be a myth, he might nevertheless use it as an illustrative argument, seeing that it was so familiar to his readers. If an inspired writer were living now, would it be quite incredible that he should make use of Dante's Purgatory, or Shakespeare's King Lear? Inspiration certainly does not preserve those who possess it from imperfect grammar, and we cannot be certain that it preserves them from other imperfections which have nothing to do with the truth that saves souls. Besides which, it may be merely our prejudices which lead us to regard the use of legendary material as an imperfection. Let us reverently examine the features which inspired writings actually present to us, not hastily determine beforehand what properties they *ought* to possess. We not unnaturally fancy that, when the Holy Spirit inspires a person to write for the spiritual instruction of men throughout all ages, He also preserves him from making mistakes as to the authenticity of writings of which he makes use, or at least would preserve him from misleading others on such points; but it does not follow that this natural expectation of ours corresponds with the actual manner of the Spirit's working. 'We follow a very unsafe method if we begin by deciding in what way it seems to us most fitting that God should guide His Church, and then try to wrest facts into conformity with our preconceptions.' (Salmon *Introd. to the N.T.* p. 528.)

I proceed to examine some passages in the notes on St. James, in which I should be inclined to differ from the view given by Dr. Plummer.

On i. 9 he adopts the explanation of ὁ πλούσιος ἐν τῇ ταπεινώσει αὐτοῦ given by

Beyschlag after Bede, 'let the rich man, if he will, glory in his own degradation.' In his own words, 'Let the brother of low degree glory in his high estate; and the rich man—what is he to glory in?—let him glory in the only thing upon which he can count with certainty, viz. his being brought low: because as the flower of the grass he shall pass away.' He adds, 'Such irony is not uncommon in Scripture.' But why may not we take the passage in what is certainly its more simple and natural sense, understanding καυχάσθω ὁ ἀδελφός at the beginning of the verse to belong not more to the first clause ὁ ταπεινὸς ἐν τῷ ὑψεῖ than to the second ὁ δὲ πλούσιος ἐν τ.τ.? The general meaning will then be, 'Far from being δόρυχος and ἀκατάστατος, the Christian should exult in his profession: if in low estate, he should glory in the church, where all are brothers and there is no respect of persons; he should realize his own dignity as a member of Christ, a child of God, an heir of heaven; if rich, he should cease to pride himself on wealth or rank, and rejoice that he has learnt the emptiness of all worldly distinctions.' To the despised poor the lesson of Christianity is 'learn self-respect,' to the proud rich 'learn self-abasement.' While we must allow that sarcasm is not alien to the writer of ii. 19, iv. 4, v. 1—6, yet is it possible that so early in his letter, in cold blood so to speak, he could thus have anathematized the rich as a class, when we remember that Nicodemus, Joseph of Arimathea and Barnabas were included among believers? That the words of the comparison which follows do not apply exclusively to the rich, is of course self-evident, and is also expressly stated in the original passage of Isaiah, πάντα σὰρξ ὑψόρος, though the rich may need to be reminded of the truth more than the poor. Nor can anything be inferred against this from the use of ὁ πλούσιος in the eleventh verse, 'the rich man [not 'riches'] shall fade away.' All that is meant is 'the rich man, *qua* rich, whether believer or unbeliever, is a mere passing phenomenon; in the world to come there is neither rich nor poor.'

iii. 3. Dr. Plummer here follows the majority of the editors and what seems at first sight to be the overwhelming authority of the MSS. in reading εἰ δέ. I say at first sight, for we find it supported in Tischendorf's Apparatus by the following uncials Sin. ABKL as well as by Vulg. and Corb., while 78ε has only the uncials CP with some eastern versions on its side; but looking a little more closely we find that it is a characteristic of B 'to change εἰ into εἰ' (WH. *Introd.* p. 306),

so that in this Epistle it gives us not only *γενώσκοντες*, *θλείψαι*, *ρεπιζομένω*, but even *ἀνθρωπείνη*, *ἀτρείς*; and the same with regard to *Sin.* which, as Dr. Field tells us (*Ot. Norv.* on this verse), gives *εἶδον* for *ἰδοῦ* Luke xxiii. 15, *εἶδε* for *ἰδε* Luke xxiv. 39 and 1 John iii. 1. Nor is this all: *Sin.* has *εἰδεγαρ*, which if written in three words makes nonsense, but, if *εἰδε* stands for *ἰδε*, gives *ecce enim* with the Peshitto. The evidence of the MSS. being thus doubtful, let us consider which reading is best in harmony with the context, 'If a man does not stumble in word he is able to bridle his own body. And if we put bits into the horses' mouths that they may obey us,—we turn about their whole body also.' The natural apodosis to such a protasis would be 'let us also for the same purpose put a bridle in our own lips.' The present apodosis adds nothing to the clause *εἰς τὸ πείθεσθαι*, and it is difficult to find any natural meaning for *δέ* at the beginning of the verse: even the *καί* in apodosis is out of place; it would have been natural if the protasis had run *εἰ τὸ στόμα μετάγομεν*. Lastly the *καί* after *ἰδοῦ* in v. 4 seems to look back to the preceding *ἰδε*. De Wette and Benschlag felt these difficulties so strongly that they included the whole verse in the protasis and explained the construction as an apodosis. Lachmann proposed to read *οὐδέ* with a question instead of *εἰ δέ*. But with *ἰδε* we get exactly the right sense. The casual use of the word *χαλαναγωγῆσαι* in v. 2 suggests the image to which *ἰδε* calls the reader's attention, just as *ἰδοῦ* introduces a simile in v. 7. The active imperative is found along with the middle in Eccl. ii. 1 *πειράσω σε ἐν εὐφροσύνῃ καὶ ἰδε ἐν ἀγαθῷ καὶ ἰδοὺ καὶ γε τοῦτο ματαιότης*, in Mark iii. 32 and 34, and elsewhere. Dr. Field compares Rom. ii. 17 where the old reading *ἰδε σὺ Ἰουδαῖος* has been changed to *εἰ δέ* by recent editors, misled by the spelling of the uncial MSS., as in our text, and with equally disastrous effect on the construction.

iii. 6. *ὁ κόσμος τῆς ἀδικίας ἢ γλῶσσα καθίσταται ἐν τοῖς μέλεσιν ἡμῶν*. Dr. Plummer gives what I believe to be the right punctuation, and translates: 'The world of iniquity among our members is the tongue, which defileth the whole body.' I doubt however whether he is right in assigning a loose colloquial signification to the word *κόσμος*, which he explains with the Vulgate as *universitas iniquitatis* 'a boundless store of mischief.' The objection to this is that St. James elsewhere only uses the word *κόσμος* in a bad sense, and that only one example out of all Greek literature is adduced for

the meaning 'totality,' viz. Prov. xvii. 6 *τοῦ πιστοῦ ὅλος ὁ κόσμος τῶν χρημάτων*, *τοῦ δὲ ἀπίστου οὐδὲ ὀβολός*, which however is, I think, better understood literally of the material world, as consisting of things which can be used and enjoyed. Lastly the article seems scarcely consistent with this explanation. 'A world of cares' is a natural expression for many cares; but if we say 'the world of care' we are understood to predicate something of the world itself. And if we compare the similar expressions in Luke xvi. 8, 9, *τὸν οἰκονόμον τῆς ἀδικίας*, *τοῦ μαμωνᾶ τῆς ἀδικίας*, we are naturally led to take the sentence as meaning 'in our microcosm the tongue represents or constitutes the unrighteous world,' as it is in the 'Speculum,' *mundus iniquitatis per linguam constat in membris vestris*. The tongue represents the world because it is that member by which we are brought into communication with other men. Again I am inclined to doubt whether Dr. Plummer is right in treating *καθίσταται* as a middle: 'by its own undisciplined career it makes itself' the world of iniquity, it constitutes itself among our members as that which defileth our whole body.' Out of twenty-two examples in Bruder, sixteen belong to the active voice, and two are 1st aor. passive, leaving four examples of the ambiguous *καθίσταται*, two of which are undoubtedly passive (Heb. v. 1, viii. 3), and the other two are that before us and iv. 4 below. The Vulgate here has *constituitur*, the Corbey MS. *posita est*, and this, as I believe, gives us the literal meaning, 'is set' or 'is constituted,' cf. Thuc. iv. 92, Isocr. p. 37.

Is the special force of the word *ἐπιθεία* rightly traced in p. 198: 'a word which originally meant...weaving for hire, and thence any ignoble pursuit, especially political canvassing, intrigue, or factiousness'? If the word and its cognates were in commoner use we should be able to speak with more confidence, but I think its development should rather be compared with that of the Lat. *ambitio*. *Ἐπιθεύεσθαι* is not 'to be a hireling' but 'to make use of hirelings,' 'to bribe,' and thus *ἐπιθεία* comes to mean 'party-spirit.'

In iv. 2 Dr. Plummer seems to be unaware that he is not the first to propose the punctuation 'Ye lust and have not; ye kill.' It is given in the margin of WH., and was the subject of more than one note in this *Review* (see Vol. iii. pp. 275 f. 314.)

iv. 5. *πρὸς φθόνον ἐπιποθεῖ τὸ πνεῦμα ὁ κατόικισεν ἐν ἡμῖν*. This is translated 'Even unto jealousy doth the Spirit which He made to dwell in us yearn over us,' but is there any precedent for such a use of *πρός*? We



may get almost the same meaning if we take *πρὸς φθόνον* = *φθονερῶς* with the Greek commentators, and there are many parallels for this adverbial use, e.g. *πρὸς βίαν*, *πρὸς ἡδονήν*, *πρὸς ὀργήν*, *πρὸς χάριν*.

iv. 9 *ταλαιπωρήσατε καὶ πενήσατε καὶ κλαύσατε*. 'The first verb refers to their inward feeling of wretchedness, the other two to the outward expression of it.' But neither in the LXX. nor in classical Greek do we find *ταλαιπωρεῖν* so used: cf. Thuc. ii. 101 ἡ στρατιὰ σιτόν τε οὐκ εἶχεν καὶ ὑπὸ χειμῶνος ἐταλαιπώρει, Jerem. v. 20 *τεταλαιπώρηκε πάντα ἡ γῆ* ('is spoiled' R.V.). It seems best to understand it with Erasmus and Grotius *affligite ipsos vosmet ipsos et aliis corporis sceleratioribus*, especially when we consider that St. James was himself noted for his austerities.

v. 11. *πολύσπλαγχος*. The word 'was possibly coined by St. James himself; it occurs nowhere else.' It is remarkable how many words are used apparently for the first time by St. James: it is not however correct to say that this is found nowhere else. It occurs in the writings of Hermas, that most diligent student of St. James, see *Mand.* iii. 5, *Sim.* v. 7. 4.

In one or two passages there is perhaps a tendency to press unduly the force of words. Thus in ii. 25 Rahab is introduced as a second example of faith proved by action—*ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ Ραββὶ ἡ πορνὴ οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων ἐδικαιώθη*; on which the comment is: "The readers of the epistle might think 'Heroic acts are all very suitable for Abraham, but...we cannot imitate his acts.' 'But,' St. James replies (and he

writes *ὁμοίως δέ*, not *καὶ ὁμοίως*) 'there is Rahab ...at least you can imitate her.' Is there however any reason to suppose that St. James meant any thing more than 'and also' by his *δὲ καὶ*? Dr. Plummer himself is content to translate *δέ* by 'and' in i. 13, 15, ii. 2, 3. On ii. 4 *ἰδοὺ καὶ τὰ πλοῖα* the note is: 'In order to bring out the fact that the ships are a stronger illustration than the horses we should translate 'Behold even the ships' rather than 'Behold the ships also.' First the statement of the case (ver. 2), then the illustration from the horses (ver. 3), then 'even the ships' (ver. 4), and finally the application 'so the tongue also' (ver. 5)." But does the Greek give any hint that *καὶ* is to be translated differently in the two verses? I should prefer 'also' in both cases.

v. 15. *κἂν ἁμαρτίας ἢ πεπονηκός*. Dr. Plummer here seems to yield to the authority of Alford, Huther and others who have denied that *κἂν* can mean 'and if.' The contrary is proved by Mark xvi. 18, Luke xiii. 9 Dem. *F.L.* 411. *οὗτος ἐκτρέπεται με νῦν ἀπαντῶν, κἂν ἀναγκασθῇ πον συντυχῆν, ἀπεπῆδραεν εὐθέως*, Xen. *Anab.* i. 8, 12, iii. 36 &c. and several instances in the newly discovered 'Constitution of Athens.'

It is to some extent a drawback to the use of the book, considered as a commentary, that some verses, and those not always the easiest or the least interesting, are passed over without remark, such as i. 19—21, 26, 27, ii. 11—13, 18. On the whole however it is one which may be most strongly recommended to all educated readers.

J. B. MAYOR.

#### WILCKEN'S GREEK PALAEOGRAPHY.

*Tafeln zur älteren Griechischen Palaeographie nach originalen des Berliner Koenigl. Museums, zum akademischen Gebrauch und zum Selbstunterricht*, herausgegeben von DR. ULRICH WILCKEN. Leipzig u. Berlin: Giesecke and Devrient, 1891. 10 Mk.

PROFESSOR WILCKEN has issued what we may hope is only the beginning of a very useful work. He is already so well known as an authority on early Greek writing that a series of facsimiles, such as this, accompanied with his comments, is a very welcome contribution to Greek Palaeography. The work will appeal to a much wider circle of students than those for whom the editor

modestly designs it. Indeed he only invites beginners to learn something of early Greek documents, and more particularly of cursive hands, with a view to a better understanding of the principles of the minuscule writing of the Middle Ages; and in order to encourage them he refrains 'aus pädagogischen Gründen' from giving transcripts of more than a few lines of each document, leaving the student to puzzle out the rest for himself 'mit eigenem Kopfzerbrechen.' Now, this is all very well in a work in which the facsimiles are produced from MSS. in good condition and are therefore sufficiently legible; but here we have quite a different state of things. Papyri are seldom in perfect, or even good,

condition—from the very nature of the material, the majority are fragmentary, torn, and discoloured, and their reproduction by photography, in a manner at all satisfactory, is by no means a simple matter. Dr. Wilcken's facsimiles leave much to be desired; they could certainly have been made better; some indeed are good, but others are decided failures, as he himself admits. It is, then, cruel kindness to set such difficult pieces before the beginner and to refuse him the assistance of transcriptions. In reading an obscure original, one has the advantage of being able to turn it about to catch the light on it at favourable angles; but a photographic facsimile can only represent it in a fixed position and under only one condition of light, in which faint lines may disappear or be absorbed in the dark background of the material. But, as we have already said, Dr. Wilcken's work will be used by others besides palaeographical students. The recent discoveries of classical works and fragments in Egypt raise hopes of a resurrection of a fair number of the lost works of early Greek writers; and scholars will find it useful and even necessary to know something of the branch of palaeography which Dr. Wilcken has undertaken to illustrate. It is to be hoped therefore that in the future issues, which we are confident will be called for, he will extend the usefulness of his work by giving those aids which will obviate unnecessary 'head-breaking.'

The minuscule hand of the Middle Ages, as Dr. Wilcken observes, was not a new creation. It was nothing more than the cursive hand of the day adopted as a literary hand and written with care by skilled penmen. For the earliest form of this cursive hand we must go back as far as Greek writing exists, to the third century B.C. A few documents of this period have for years been in European libraries and have been published, but their extreme antiquity has not always been recognized. Many of them have hitherto been generally thought to belong to the Roman period; but the recent discovery by Mr. Flinders Petrie of many dated specimens of the third century B.C., a selection of which has just now been edited by Professor Mahaffy, gives the clue to their real age. It is most important to find, at this early time, a cursive hand side by side with a formal literary hand, written in a variety of styles and with the greatest freedom: an absolute proof of its existence at a still earlier period. Indeed there is no reason why the Greeks, almost as

soon as they had got their alphabet and had learnt to write, should not have used a cursive hand; on the contrary there is every reason why they should have done so. The only extant specimens of Greek writing of archaic times are a few painfully engraved inscriptions on stone or metal; and we are apt to regard these as the standard of writing of the period. But supposing that all written documents of our own day were to perish, and that some centuries hence the only surviving records of the nineteenth century were to be found in our churchyards and on one or two monuments, ought our descendants then to infer that we knew nothing of a current hand? If a party of Greek mercenaries some six hundred years B.C. had knowledge enough of writing to inscribe not only their own names but also inscriptions on the statues of Abu Simbel, it is not too much to assume that they could also use their pens with dexterity.

The first six plates of his series Dr. Wilcken devotes to specimens of uncial writing; the rest, to examples of cursive. We do not agree with him when he speaks of the attempt to date uncial writing as an idle enterprise. It is true, as he says, that this style of writing is a copyist's hand which naturally may become stereotyped; but even in formal writing there is a character of the period which may generally be recognized. As regards cursive writing his view is certainly correct that it is impossible to fix accurate dates for forms of certain letters. The same form may run on for centuries; may disappear from some documents, and may reappear in others. It is necessary, however, for palaeography to classify documents; and Dr. Wilcken's three periods, the Ptolemaic, the Roman, and the Byzantine, will appeal to all who have experience as the three main divisions under which early Greek documents seem naturally to group themselves.

The uncial specimens chiefly represent classical fragments; but the third is an exception and is interesting as having been identified, since its publication here, as a fragment of the 'Shepherd' of Hermas. The first cursives are from papyri of the second century B.C., for, although Dr. Wilcken quotes specimens of the third century B.C., none appear to have been available for his work. It is curious that the Berlin collection affords no papyrus dated in the first century after Christ, and that only a few examples of this period exist at Vienna. Dr. Wilcken therefore falls back upon ostraka to furnish material for that time;

and he follows them up with specimens of the second and third centuries from Arsinoë. As in all times, the official hand of the papyri is quite distinctive, as seen in a contract for the sale of a camel in A.D. 289 (No. xiv.), and in a curious document of the year 359, written at Askalon and relating to the purchase of a slave (No. xvi.), a certain Argutis, apparently a Gaul, who passed from one Flavius Agemundus, a Roman officer, to

Flavius Vitalianus, who held a command in the garrison of Arsinoë, where the papyrus was found. The series closes with specimens of the seventh and eighth century, the last being two of the diminutive receipts on vellum, of which a fair number have been recovered, and the writing of which is to be compared with the early minuscule literary hand.

E. MAUNDE THOMPSON.

#### GRAUX'S FACSIMILES OF GREEK MANUSCRIPTS IN SPAIN.

*Fac-Similés de Manuscrits Grecs d'Espagne*, gravés d'après les photographies de CHARLES GRAUX, avec transcriptions et notices par M. ALBERT MARTIN. Paris: Hachette. 1891. 25 fcs.

THIS work consists of a series of plates from Greek MSS. in Spain, originally prepared by Charles Graux, whose untimely death cut short this as well as other tasks which he would have completed to the advantage of Greek Palaeography. The series has been supplemented and described by Monsieur Albert Martin. M. Graux's design was to place in the hands of students a set of facsimiles which he considered would be of the greatest practical utility; and he accordingly confined his field within the limits of the ninth century on the one side and the date of the fall of Constantinople on the other.

Of the fifty-four specimens contained in the fifteen plates which are due to M. Graux's selection, twenty-five are taken from fifteen dated MSS. ranging between the years 1100 and 1436. The undated examples are mostly from MSS. of the ninth and tenth centuries. They present among them examples of the later styles of uncial writing, as found in the MS. of the Gospels in the Camarino (nos. 1, 2) or chamber of relics in the Escorial, of the ninth or tenth century, written in a large character; a volume of Homilies (nos. 3, 4), in smaller sloping letters, of the ninth century; an especially interesting MS. of glosses on the *Iliad* (nos. 5, 6) in very neat writing, both sloping uncial and minuscule, attributed to the ninth or tenth century; and a copy of the Gospels with Catena (nos. 10-14) of the same period. An attempt to reproduce a palimpsest page (no. 7) is not altogether successful; but a better effect is produced in

nos. 9, 10. The most beautiful specimens of the undated series come from an exquisite minuscule MS. of the Gospels (nos. 16, 17) assigned to the tenth century.

Of the dated MSS. the examples naturally fall into two groups of minuscule writing: the set formal hand carrying on the traditions of the ecclesiastical style of older periods; and the more cursive and untrammelled writing of natural development. The former adds to our stock of facsimiles of their kind, the most noteworthy specimens being taken from a MS. of ascetic writings (nos. 28, 29) of the year 1035, the writing of which imitates the upright characters of the two preceding centuries. The other group contains examples of the more or less intricate writing of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, taken from three paper MSS.: a lexicon of Zonaras (nos. 44, 45), of the year 1256; an Aristotle of 1286; and an *Iliad* of 1309. The text of the last is arranged in a peculiar manner, in two columns of verses, to be read across the page, the first column having the even numbers of the lines, and the second column the odd numbers (xxiv. 738-804).

To illustrate the decoration of MSS. M. Graux has included some reproductions of miniatures; but they are quite insufficient for the purpose. Had the photographs been taken recently, no doubt we should have had really good representations of the paintings, the art of photographing colours being now better understood. As they stand, the plates only serve to register the existence of the illuminated pages. One of them (no. 42), from a book of Hymns of the fourteenth or fifteenth century, is of interest as it contains Italian accessories in the ornamentation.

The three plates which are added by M. Martin contain facsimiles from the MS. of Plutarch, of the fourteenth century, which

M. Graux first brought into prominent notice for the value of its text, and specimens of the hands of certain scribes of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries not represented in M. Omont's series. One may be noticed (no. 62), as an old man's hand, the work of

Constantine Lascaris, *ἀντράχ' ἐπὶ γήραος οὐδὲν*.

The descriptions of M. Martin are carefully minute. The absence, however, of a table of plates causes some inconvenience in reference. E. MAUNDE THOMPSON.

#### LIEBENAM ON THE HISTORY AND ORGANIZATION OF THE ROMAN COLLEGIA.

*Zur Geschichte und Organisation des römischen Vereinswesens. Drei Untersuchungen von W. LIEBENAM. Leipzig. 1890. 10 Mk.*

OF the monographs which were bound to follow the publication of the Berlin *Corpus*, one on the Roman collegia, both from the importance and extent of the subject, might have been expected to be among the first. It is now forty-eight years since Mommsen's *de Collegiis et Sodalicis* laid the foundation of an investigation into this subject and, in spite of the comparative dearth and inaccessibility at the time of the epigraphical evidence, on which in fact nearly all depends, laid them so well that most of his principal assumptions will be found not inconsistent with the fuller evidence of which we are now in possession. The last twenty years have not been altogether without contributions of more or less value to our knowledge of the collegial system. Dr. Cohn (*zum römischen Vereinsrecht* 1873) has, along with a good deal that is injudicious and even paradoxical, done valuable work in clearing up the legal aspect of the question, while Dr. Hermann Maué (*der praefectus fabrum* 1887), though dealing mainly with a particular point, has nevertheless thrown a good deal of light on the history of the imperial policy towards collegia. To historical students however both these works still left many lacunae in their knowledge, which no single publication offered the means of filling up. To a great extent they are now filled by the work whose title is placed at the head of this notice. Dr. Liebenam has already performed some useful work (noticed in the 3rd vol. of this *Review*, p. 206) in connexion with the system of Roman administration, but while he has hitherto mainly shown himself to be an accurate and industrious collector of epigraphical material, his present work is of a somewhat more constructive character, and if we cannot admit that he has entirely performed the task which he set himself in the preface of doing something to clear up

the life and position of the lower classes in the Roman empire by an investigation of the collegia which apparently formed so important a factor in their lives, at least we get from his work a very complete idea of the extent and variety of the collegia in all parts of the empire and also a better grounded theory of the relations between them and the Roman government than any previous work has laid down. Dr. Liebenam has divided his subject into three parts: (1) the historical development of the collegial system in its broad outlines, showing how what were originally free associations of workmen (for it is with the collegia opificum that he is mainly concerned) became after the time of Alexander Severus regular state-institutions or compulsory corporations subserving not their own but the public interest, so that just as the coloni were bound to the soil, so the industrial population were bound to the collegia and their liabilities; (2) a very full list depending on epigraphical evidence of the various collegia opificum throughout the Roman empire, together with an appendix in which a bird's eye view is given geographically arranged; (3) the organisation of the collegia and their relations to the Roman government. This division of the subject, though in the main a convenient one, involves a certain amount of repetition as regards the relations between the collegia and the State, concerning as they do both the historical development treated in part 1, and the organisation and legal position belonging to part 3. In the historical sketch Dr. Liebenam lays stress on the following points:—The list of original collegia given by Plutarch (*Num.* 17) he suspects of being unhistorical because it is not in harmony with what is known of the state of culture in the earliest times, the existence of *χρυσόχοι* e.g. contradicting Pliny (*h.n.* 33, 5, 14), while other industries which must have existed in early Rome are omitted. In opposition to Cohn who argued that, as every collegium had a sacral basis and the senate



had a general oversight over sacral matters, every collegium from the first needed a license from the senate, Liebenam asserts with Mommsen the complete freedom of association under the republic. This view is surely alone reconcilable with what Gaius (*Dig.* 47, 22, 4) lays down from the XII. Tables: 'his (sodalibus eiusdem collegii) potestatem facit lex pactionem quam velint sibi facere, dum ne quid ex publica lege corrumpant.' The collegia put down by the s.c. of 64 B.C. (68 according to Cohn, *vid. Ascon. in Pis.* § 8) were neither the collegia opificum, as Cohn argues, nor the compitalicia only, as Mommsen thinks, but those of whatever character which were considered dangerous. The measure of Julius Caesar (*Suet. Caes.* 42) was not a general law, but merely a pontifical edict, the substance of which was afterwards embodied in the lex Julia. No permanent or legislative change of policy in dealing with the collegia was attempted till the lex Julia of Augustus by which 'collegia praeter antiqua et legitima dissolvit' (*Suet. Aug.* 32). This law, relating at first to the city and only gradually and at uncertain dates extending to Italy and the provinces, is rightly taken by Liebenam as the basis on which rested the imperial policy towards collegia. Under the head of *antiqua* would come (a) the original collegia opificum, (b) the ancient sacral colleges; while by *legitima* must be understood (a) retrospectively, all those which had in any way been already sanctioned by law or edict, as e.g. the Jewish associations which were specially tolerated (*Joseph. A.I.* 14, 10, 8), (b) prospectively, all those which in Rome, Italy or the senatorial provinces had the special authorisation of the senate (cf. the phrase so often found in inscriptions 'quibus ex s.c. coire licet') or in the imperial provinces the approbation of the emperor expressed by his legate. This view is no doubt consistent with most of our data; but it is well to mention in passing that we have in an imperial province 'collegia tria quibus ex s.c. coire permissum est' (*C.I.L.* v. 7881), while conversely we have an instance at Hispalis in a senatorial province of a collegium apparently founded by the emperor without any authorisation from the senate (*C.I.L.* ii. 1167). An important question and one which is entangled with many difficulties is that which relates to the action of the imperial government with respect to the *collegia illicita*. Dr. Liebenam's discussion of this seems to meet the difficulties in most respects, though he still leaves the technical meaning of *collegium illicitum* a little too un-

certain. I do not know whether he would accept the following condensed sketch as a statement of his views. It is the result to which a somewhat careful study of the literature of the subject and especially of his own work has led me. The primary object of the lex Julia being to put an end to political danger from collegia, all existing collegia were dissolved 'praeter antiqua et legitima,' while new ones had to receive the authorisation of senate or emperor (Gaius in *Dig.* 3, 4, 1). Only those would receive this authorisation which were (1) non-political, (2) served some public utility (compare *C.I.L.* vi., 2193 *ludorum causa* and *Dig.* 50, 6, 6, 12 'ut necessariam operam publicis utilitatibus exhiberent'). In effect this would mean that the only licensed collegia were *collegia opificum*, whether employed as fire-brigades, like the fabri, centonarii and dendrophori, or for purposes of the corn-supply like the navicularii, caudicarii and mensores etc. Collegia so licensed were *legitima*, *licita*, '*licite coeuntia*.' All collegia not included in this class were *illicita* (*ἀθέμιτον δὲ σύστημα ἢ σωματεῖον ἐστὶ τὸ μὴ ἀπὸ νόμου ἢ βασιλέως νοσῶν Basilica* 60, 32), but were by no means all treated in the same way by the state, except in so far as none of them had any legal rights or privileges such as receiving legacies etc. (*Dig.* 34, 5, 20). It is clear however from this passage of the *Digest* that the existence of certain unlicensed collegia was tolerated ('si corpori cui licet coire legatum sit, debeatur, cui autem non licet si legetur, non valebit nisi singulis legetur: hi enim non quasi collegium, sed quasi certi homines admittentur ad legatum'). Similarly the *eranus* at Amisos was not licensed, but was left untouched out of respect to vested rights. On the other hand the toleration of these unlicensed collegia was always precarious. If any political danger was suspected, they were at once dissolved. 'Collegia siqua fuerint illicita mandatis et constitutionibus et senatus consultis dissolvuntur' (*Dig.* 57, 22, 3). Thus e.g. in consequence of disturbances at Pompeii the collegia 'quae contra leges instituerant' (i.e. hitherto tolerated *collegia illicita*) were dissolved (*Tac. Ann.* 14, 17), while Pliny owing to the factious state of Bithynia had by Trajan's order issued an edict prohibiting all *hetaeriae* or *collegia sodalicia* (*ad Trai.* 96). Later on it was found necessary to extend this prohibition to all the provinces (*Marc. in Dig.* 47, 22, 1 'mandatis principalibus praecipitur praesidibus provinciarum ne patiantur esse collegia sodalicia'). I may note here that collegia

sodalicia = ἑταιρικά συνήματα = hetaeriae seem to me to be by no means necessarily political clubs, as they are generally explained, but simply collegia which are not *publicae utilitatis causa*, and so would include religious associations (the Christians at once felt themselves affected by Pliny's edict), social and funeral guilds, benefit societies and political associations. Conf. Plin. *ad Trai.* 34 where Trajan draws a sharp distinction between collegia fabrum and hetaeriae, though he fears that the former may degenerate into the latter. But whenever a collegium, whether originally licensed as a *collegium opificum* or existing unlicensed, was shown to be distinctly political, it was treated qua *illicitum*, in a much severer method, and it is to this class of *collegia illicita* exclusively, as it seems to me, that the passage of Ulpian refers 'quisquis collegium illicitum usurpaverit, ea poena tenetur qua tenentur qui hominibus armatis loca publica vel templa occupare iudicati sunt' (*Dig.* 47, 22, 2), while Severus ordered that this class of persons (whether members or founders of such collegia is uncertain) should be accused before the praefectus urbi. In this way I think we get an intelligible and consistent meaning for *collegium illicitum*. Properly the word means simply 'unlicensed,' but as the most dangerous class of unlicensed collegia were political, the word had a tendency in certain connexions to be used almost in that sense (conf. especially *Dig.* 47, 22, 1 'ne sub praetextu huiusmodi illicitum collegium coeat'; 47, 22, 2 cited above, and Plin. *ad Trai.* 94 'ad illicitos coetus'). Another interesting question connected with collegia is concerned with the *collegia tenuiorum*, or as they have been called, somewhat unfortunately in my opinion, since Mommsen's monograph, *collegia funeraticia nach den Inschriften*, 1888.) These, as appears from *Dig.* 47, 22, 1, were a subdivision of the collegia sodalicia, but as they were solely intended as institutions for the poorer classes, as funeral clubs or mutual assistance societies, they were once for all and at some date between Augustus and Hadrian exempted from the lex Iulia. So Marcian says after mentioning the prohibition of collegia sodalicia 'sed permittitur tenuioribus stipem menstruam conferre, dum tamen semel in mense coeant, ne sub praetextu huiusmodi illicitum collegium coeat' (*Dig.* 47, 22, 1). Liebenam in effect, as also does Schiess, follows Mommsen in the view which he takes

of these collegia, and there is no doubt that Cohn's fantastic view cannot for a moment be seriously supported. In all probability the well-known inscription relating to the collegium Dianae et Antinoi at Lanuvium contains the preamble of the s.c. by which this exemption was granted (*Wilm.* 319). But I think there is no doubt that these collegia were not merely funeral clubs, but were often used also 'ad sustinendam tenuiorum inopiam' (Plin. *ad Trai.* 93: conf. also Tertull. *Apol.* 39 'egenis alendis humandisque'). The legal description of these collegia was not *collegia funeraticia*, but *collegia tenuiorum*, *funeraticium* occurring only in inscriptions as the money granted for a funeral. Originally this exemption was confined to Rome, but Severus extended it to Italy and the provinces (*Dig.* 47, 22, 1). That it was not so extended in the time of Trajan is clear from Plin. *ad Trai.* 93 'in ceteris civitatibus quae nostro iure obstrictae sunt, res huiusmodi (i.e. the existence of an eranos) prohibenda est.' There is another point raised by Dr. Liebenam about which I hope shortly to treat more fully elsewhere, the relation between these *collegia tenuiorum* and the Christian communities. On the whole Liebenam is inclined to follow Löning in denying that the constitution of the early Christian communities was in any way derived from the collegia in the Oriental provinces. Such similarities as there were, he thinks, were of a very general kind and were such as would always be found among organised associations. To him the important question seems to be 'In what external form have the first Christian communities been able to take footing in the state at a time when all clubs and associations were subject to a severe oversight?' In considering this question he quite admits, what I do not see indeed that any one can deny, that the Christians attempted to avail themselves of the privileges granted to the *collegia tenuiorum*. With regard to the social importance of the collegia and their relation to trade traditions and trade processes Dr. Liebenam can hardly be said to have added anything to our very imperfect knowledge, but though from his preface one might have hoped for something more, our data are really not sufficient to give us the information we should like to have, and we can only say negatively with Dr. Liebenam that the importance of the collegia in these respects must not be measured by what has come down to us.

E. G. HARDY.

## FREEMAN'S HISTORY OF SICILY.

*The History of Sicily*, by EDWARD A. FREEMAN. Vols. I. and II. Oxford. 1891. £2 2s.

It is not the first time that it has fallen to my lot to introduce this work of Prof. Freeman to the learned public. I have done so already in Germany and at greater length in a forthcoming article for the French *Revue Historique*. I do not think however that this need preclude me from acceding to the proposal of the editor of the *Classical Review*, that I should do the same for England. In writing for French and German readers it was necessary to call attention to the characteristic excellences of the book in respect to form, style and tone. Such remarks would be superfluous in the case of English readers, who do not need to be taught what a distinguished writer they possess in Prof. Freeman, and who are well acquainted with his special characteristics.

The reason doubtless why I have been asked to undertake this office is that so few persons have paid sufficient attention to the subject of the history to enable them to form a correct judgment as to its value. It seems to me that that value may be summed up under three heads. In the first place Prof. Freeman is the first person who has treated his subject from the point of view of universal history. Others have written of Sicily under the ancients, of Sicily under the Mussulmans, and of Modern Sicily, but we possess no satisfactory history embracing all three periods. Now Sicily has a great significance for the history of the world. In antiquity and in the Middle Ages it came into prominence as the scene of the struggle between the East and West. This thought has found inadequate expression in accounts of travels, and in the writings of men who were fairly acquainted with the general history of the Middle Ages, but had made no special study of antiquity. Prof. Freeman writes with equal knowledge of both periods, and is thus qualified not only to set before us in general outline the universal significance of Sicilian history, but to present us with a finished picture, exhibiting every detail in its true form and colouring. Moreover his wide knowledge of general history enables him to illustrate his special subject by parallels, hitherto unnoticed, from other histories; he gives us not merely the cycles of Sicilian history, but analogies

drawn from other nations which have passed through a similar experience.

Secondly, Prof. Freeman has made a thorough study of his own particular subject. No writer of antiquity is left unused by him, few modern works have escaped his scrutiny, so that we possess in his book a general view of all that has been written on Sicily in late years. Here there is one point on which I should wish to make a remark. In I. 146 he accepts the ordinary view that Engyon is the same as the modern Gangi. I had done the same in my *History of Sicily* (I. p. 71), because I knew no better, though at the same time I called attention to the geographical difficulties which stood in the way of this identification. The question has been again raised by Pais in his *Alcune Osservazioni sulla Storia e sull'Amministrazione della Sicilia durante il dominio Romano*, Pal. 1888. He there puts forward a suggestion (p. 127) that Engyon was more probably Troina. It is to be desired that Prof. Freeman, who has travelled in Sicily and knows it better than any other classical scholar except Prof. Schubring, would on some future visits look into this point. In my notice in the *Revue Historique* I have given some instances of Prof. Freeman's admirable description of historical sites. Troina also well deserves a visit and a description from the pen of Mr. Freeman, not only from its remarkable position, in which it resembles Eryx and Castrogiovanni (see Murray's *Handbook for Sicily* by Dennis, London, 1864, p. 286), but also because it was the scene of a notable episode in the Norman Conquest of 1084 A.D. When he writes that page, he will perhaps give us also his opinion on the ancient name of Troina.

The third point which constitutes the excellence of the book lies in the fairness and the thoroughness of the discussions in which he examines the opinions of those from whom he differs. These he has usually reserved for his Appendices. In my notice in the *Revue Historique* I have stated, in reference to his discussion of the relations of the Sikans and Sikels, that his arguments have convinced me that my identification of the two was no longer tenable. One point which deserves special praise in Prof. Freeman's work is that he is never led away by a love of novelty. He does not allow himself to be imposed upon by brilliant theories, having seen so many sprung up and

pass away into obscurity, that he has no more respect for the newest than for the oldest. A proof of this may be found in his treatment of the assumed voyage of the Sikels to Egypt. Mere verbal resemblances make no impression upon him. Thus he maintains his scepticism against many of the ideas broached by Heisterbergk. As examples of sound discussion I would specify the note on the Kings in Sicily (II. App. n. 1), and that on the Temples in Ortygia (II. App. n. 4).

Of course I do not find myself always in agreement with Prof. Freeman. For instance in regard to the name Messene, later Messina, given to the town Zanklê, he says (II. p. 115): 'Anaxilas found that it suited his purposes to drive the Samian population out of the city, which he might in some sort be said to have given them. He planted Zanklê afresh with a mixed multitude of inhabitants.' 'According to one statement of the highest authority, and yet perhaps not absolutely decisive, he changed the name of the town from Zanklê to Messina. The motive assigned is a singular one. Anaxilas gave to the city the name of his remote forefathers in Peloponnesos. It is perhaps more likely that the name really belongs to a later time when it might have been bestowed on the city by settlers direct from the Peloponnesian Messênê.' Again (II. 487): 'There is really some reason to think that the city was still called Zanklê for some years after the time of Anaxilas.' In my *History of Sicily* (I. p. 412) I have stated, after Millingen, that the name Messene was given to Zanklê while the Samians were still settled there, therefore before Anaxilas had conquered it and driven out the Samians. In proof of this I have also referred to the fact that coins have been found which exhibit the Samian type, a lion's head with a calf's head on the reverse, bearing the inscription Messenion. How is this to be explained on the other supposition? Head too (*Hist. Num.* p. 134) agrees with me. Prof. Freeman refers to *Coins of Sicily* (*Cat. Brit. Mus.* pp. 100, 101) for coins with a hare upon them; but on p. 100 we find coins with lion's head and calf's head, which are usually assigned to an earlier date

than those with a hare. How does Prof. Freeman propose to escape this difficulty? From these coins it would seem that Zanklê was called Messina while the Samians still lived there. To notice some other matters of slight importance: Prof. Freeman (II, 490) expresses his surprise at a story told about Lokri in Justin. 21. 3, which is inconsistent with the fact that 'women held so great a place in Lokri.' I may remark here that in this respect Lokri occupied a unique position, as to which much has been collected in Bachofen's interesting work *Das Mutterrecht* (Stuttgart, 1861, pp. 309-334). In vol. II. p. 347 Prof. Freeman assumes that the reason why Akron chose a high place for his father's tomb was his opinion 'of his own eminence,' but this seems scarcely consistent with the words *παρὸς ἄκρον* in the inscription.

To sum up in few words our judgment of the volumes before us: they constitute an important step in advance, because they lay the foundation for a universal history of Sicily undertaken by one who is equally familiar with the earlier and the later history of the Island; one who is able to speak with authority on its art and its literature as well as upon its political history; who knows the country from personal observation, and who writes about it without prejudice and without passion. The work as a whole is worthy of the writer, though there will of course be differences of opinion on some of the points of which it treats. Some such I have noticed here, and others are referred to in my article in the *Rev. Hist.* But the performance is a great one, and it is much to be desired that the author may be able to continue his work on the same lines and give us the history of Sicily at any rate up to the year 1250 which he has himself proposed as his goal. The subsequent period up to 1860 contains much that is full of interest. Will not Prof. Freeman give us a portrait of Garibaldi as a pendant to that of Timoleon? That however is a question for the future. We look forward now with eagerness to the next volumes, which are to bring up the history to the year 264 B.C. or thereabouts.

A. HOLM.



## THE NEW EDITION OF DR. SMITH'S DICTIONARY OF ANTIQUITIES.

*A Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities*, edited by WILLIAM SMITH, LL.D.; and by WILLIAM WAYTE and G. E. MARINDIN, formerly Fellows of King's College, Cambridge. Third Edition, Revised and Enlarged, in Two Volumes, pp. 1053 and 1072. Murray, 1890-91. 63s.

THE publication of a new edition of this very useful book of reference will justly be regarded by English scholars as one of the noteworthy events of the past year. In the address on the progress of Hellenic studies delivered by the President of the Hellenic Society on June 22, it is appropriately commemorated in the following terms:—

This year has seen the completion of a work which may fitly receive mention here, both on account of the labours which have conspired to produce it, and on account of the wide interest which it possesses for various classes of students—I mean the third edition of Dr. William Smith's *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities*, edited in the first volume by Mr. Wayte and in the second by Mr. Marindin. Forty-three years have elapsed since the preceding edition—the second—appeared in 1848. No one who remembers how fruitful this long interval has been in fresh materials of every kind can wonder that the new issue is almost a new book. Scarcely twenty articles remain as they originally stood; two-thirds have been largely altered and one-third has been entirely rewritten.

To the above brief statement it is necessary to add that the new edition includes about 200 fresh articles, many of considerable length and importance, and that the services of no less than forty-four scholars have been enlisted in the task of revising and supplementing the work of the eighteen contributors to the earlier editions. The initials of the original editor, Dr. Smith, are added to many articles that now appear in a revised form, and to some that are printed for the first time, e.g., those on *Clavis* and *Clavus*, both of which are, in respect to matter and illustration, excellent specimens of what such articles ought to be. Mr. Wayte, besides editing the first volume, has contributed many valuable articles, among which may be mentioned those on Greek Antiquities, under the head of *Archon*, *Areiopagus*, *Boule*, *Demus*, *Ecclesia*, *Eisphora*, *Gerousia*, *Helotes*, and *Phonos*; also the distinctly original article on *Cruz*, and (among others) those on *Arvales Fratres*, *Decumae*, *Duodecim Scripta*, *Histrion*, *Latrunculi*, *Servus* and *Tormentum* (in the forensic, not the military, sense of the term). His notices of

*Crypta*, *Emissarium*, and *Piscina* are enriched with reminiscences of travel among the Alban Hills and by the Bay of Naples, while his description of the *Lautumiae* has gained in vividness from his visit to Syracuse.

Some of the most satisfactory articles on Greek Constitutional Antiquities are contributed by Mr. A. H. Cooke, *Metocus* and *Rex* (Gk.), and by Professor Ridgeway (*Polemarchus*); while the revision of the articles on Attic Law, by Mr. C. R. Kennedy and others, has been mainly executed by the thoroughly competent skill of Dr. Hermann Hager. In Roman Law, the work of Mr. George Long and others is either largely revised or wholly superseded by that of Mr. Roby (*Actio*, *Adoptio*, *Agrariae Leges*), Mr. Whittuck (*Jurisdictio*, *Jurisconsulti*, *Jus* &c.), and Dr. Moyle (*Usucapio*, *Usufructus*, *Usus* &c.), who is also the author of a very complete article on *Provincia*.

The constitutional history of Rome is ably set forth by Professor Pelham (*Princeps* and *Senatus*), Mr. Strachan Davidson (*Patricii*, *Plebiscitum*, and *Populus*), Mr. E. G. Hardy (*Tribus*) and Mr. Greenidge (*Proconsul*, *Procurator*, *Rex*, *Socii*). The scholar last named further contributes the instructive articles on *Imagines*, *Strategus* and *Tyrannus*. Returning to Roman antiquities we find *Aediles*, *Aerarii*, *Calendarium*, *Censor*, *Colonia*, *Comitia*, *Equites*, *Quaestor* and *Servus* among the many topics treated by the prolific pen of Professor Wilkins, who has also revised the late Professor W. Ramsay's notices of *Agricultura*, *Astronomia*, *Fasti* and *Vinum*. The same scholar's article on *Vestales* is adequately enlarged and brought up to date by Mr. W. W. Fowler, who writes a new and excellent article on the *Libri Sibyllini*. Mr. F. T. Richards contributes valuable notices of *Phoros*, *Portorium*, *Scriba* and other subjects.

The department of domestic Antiquities is well represented by Professor W. C. F. Anderson, who deals with Dress under the headings of *Paenula*, *Pallium*, *Toga*, *Tunica* &c., and also writes on *Phalerae*, *Sella* &c. It is to be regretted that his interesting investigation of the meaning of *Fulcra*, contributed to the *Classical Review* in 1889 (iii. 323), and printed in abstract in the recent English edition of Seyffert's *Dictionary of Antiquities*, was apparently too late to be incorporated either in Mr. Marindin's article on *Lectus* or in his own on *Sella*. There is

much careful work in the contributions of Mr. Flather (*Amuletum, Ctesibica machina* &c.), Professor A. Goodwin, Mr. M. R. James (who writes on *Cottabos* alone), Mr. W. M. Lindsay, Mr. G. M. Rushforth and the late Mr. Onions.

A very large amount of excellent matter is supplied by the skilful editor of the second volume, Mr. Marindin. Among the many interesting articles signed by him may be mentioned those on *Oscilla*, on Games of Ball (*Pila*) and on Weaving (*Tela*). A still greater variety of themes is traversed with equal success by Mr. L. C. Purser, who writes on *Artifices* and on *Athletae*, on *Castra* and *Exercitus*, on *Signa* and *Tormenta*, on *Chorus* and *Persona*, on *Dionysia* and *Thesmophoria*, on *Orphica* and *Apotheosis*. Mr. J. R. Mozley (among other contributions) has an important article on *Oraculum*. One of the translators of Pindar, Mr. Ernest Myers, writes on the Pentathlon: Mr. J. I. Beare, on the Greek Games (*Olympia* &c.), following somewhat closely in the steps of Krause, and also on *Cursus Publicus*. His long and interesting article on the latter subject will facilitate the English reader's study of the learned researches of continental writers on the Roman Postal Service. Mr. H. A. Perry supplies a comprehensive disquisition on Roman Roads (*Viae*). The Head Master of Eton writes with freshness and interest on the Ships of the Ancients (*Ratis* and *Navis*). Dr. Greenwell, *medicorum eruditissimus*, is the author of the articles on *Chirurgia* and *Medicina*. The Provost of Oriel has revised the late Mr. W. F. Donkin's abstruse account of Ancient Music, while the Principal of Brasenose has contributed a new article on *Rhythmica*, which is one of several welcome instances in which this work gives us even more than we have a right to demand in a *Dictionary of Antiquities*. Professor Nettleship is represented by a very valuable article on the subject of *Satura*, which he has already elucidated in a well-known monograph; and Professor Jebb is the author of two elaborate treatises on *Theatrum* and *Tragoedia*, which, even apart from the importance of their subject-matter, are masterpieces of literary skill and lucid arrangement.

For the articles on the theory of numbers (*Arithmetica*) and the art of calculation (*Logistica*), and for the revision of the *Tables of Weights and Measures*, the editors have been fortunate in securing the aid of Dr. Gow. *Mensura* and *Metallum* are due to Professor Ridgeway; *Pondera* to Dr. Percy Gardner, who contributes a valuable series

of numismatical articles under the names of the various metals used for coinage (*aes, aurum, argentum, electrum*), and under the headings of the coins in general use. In these respects, and in almost everything connected with ancient art (though not in this department of study alone), the present edition shows a marked advance on its predecessor. Professor Middleton writes with instructive fulness of detail on matters of ancient architecture, under headings such as *Murus* and *Templum*. Some of the careful articles on cognate subjects, signed J. M., are contributed by Mr. J. Marshall, late Scholar of Trinity College, Cambridge, whose name is accidentally omitted in some of the earlier copies of the Dictionary. It is only to be regretted that the inadequately brief article on *Architectura*, which consists of only two pages, reprinted from the former edition, has not been rewritten, or at any rate revised and expanded, by a competent authority such as Professor Middleton. He has enriched Mr. Wornum's article on *Pigments* (s.v. *Colores*) with many additional facts derived from recent discoveries; but a comparison of Mr. Wornum's abstract of Sir Humphry Davy's paper on the 'Colours used by the Ancients' with the original in the *Transactions of the Royal Society*, 1815, will show that that portion of the article requires still further revision to bring it into harmony with Sir H. Davy's statements. Sir Humphry did not, and indeed could not (without inaccuracy), speak of 'blue and green oxides of copper' (p. 484b and 485a). The oxides of copper (I am assured) are, one of them red and the other black.

We have excellent articles on *Ars Statuaria* by Mr. Ernest A. Gardner (as well as on *Propylaea, Sarcophagus* and *Stele*); on *Terracottas* by Mr. A. S. Murray; on *Pictura* (including *Mosaics*) by Mr. Cecil Smith, who (under the heading *Fictile*) gives a full and lucid description of the technical processes used in the manufacture of Vases, *Vase-paintings* being reserved for a long and elaborate article by Mr. H. Arnold Tabbs. *Gems* and *Gem engraving* are adequately treated in two instructive articles by Mr. A. Hamilton Smith, while his brother, Mr. H. Babington Smith, is the author of two well written and well illustrated papers on *Funus* and *Sepulchrum*. The *Mausoleum* is the subject of an admirable monograph by its discoverer, Sir Charles Newton. Lastly, Mr. Warwick Wroth gives a good account of ancient mirrors under *Speculum*, and of the ornamental metal work of the Greeks and Romans under *Caelatura*.

There are more than 450 new woodcuts in this edition, but we are bound to say that some of the most important articles (as their able writers would doubtless be the first to acknowledge) are inadequately illustrated. Thus, there is not a single cut to *Caelatura* or *Pictura*, although the latter includes the subject of *Mosaics*, which lends itself readily to effective illustration. The reproductions of coins are sometimes little better than unintelligible blots on a black background; see *Danaces*: but it is fair to add that most of them are much better executed than this. Several of the most interesting cuts represent objects recently acquired by the British Museum, e.g. part of a Roman water-wheel (s.v. *Rota*), and a pepper-box (*piperatorium*) representing a negro slave clad in a *paenula*, with small holes drilled in his head. Under *Circus* a somewhat feeble copy of the statue of an *Auriga* in the Vatican is retained from the former edition, although the accomplished writer of the article in its revised form points out that the head shown in the cut does not belong to it. A better representation of the same statue, properly restored, might have been found in Schreiber's *Bilderatlas* I xxi 7 (borrowed in the English edition of Seyffert, p. 139). Under *Coma* (i 498b), it is obviously the figure to the left and not the one to the right that is the head of the Niobe. Under *Corona*, a relief representing 'Homer crowned and enthroned' is described as borrowed from Bartoli's *Admiranda*, without the slightest hint that it is really part of the famous 'Apotheosis of Homer' which was found at Bovillae and is now in the British Museum. Under *Cothurnus*, where we have an excellent cut representing a tragic actor, copied from Daremberg and Saglio, we should have welcomed a reference to the beautiful reproduction of this ivory statuette in Baumeister's *Denkmäler*, fig. 1637. The cut in i p. 790 s.v. *Exercitus*, representing a Roman soldier on horseback trampling on a fallen foe, is described as borrowed from 'Iwan Müller's *Handbuch*,' i.e. from the account of Roman *Kriegsalterthümer* contributed to that encyclopaedic work by Dr. Hermann Schiller. Neither there nor here are we told where the original is to be found, but (unless I am much mistaken) it is to be seen at the Museum at Mainz, and I certainly remember seeing a monument of exactly the same type (the *Dexileos* type) in the Museum at Bonn. *Hasta* is illustrated, as in the old edition, by a cut representing a 'Spear with *amentum*, from an Etruscan vase'; but the method of discharging the

javelin is better explained by a vase in the British Museum copied in Daremberg and Saglio (s.v. *amentum*), in the English edition of Seyffert, p. 262, and elsewhere. In this article a reference might perhaps have been given to Köchly's elaborate paper in the transactions of the *Philologische Versammlung in Heidelberg*, 1866. The first illustration to *Oscilla* is described as 'Offerings at a rustic festival. From an ancient engraved cup (Bötticher).' In the text it is called 'an onyx-cup in the Paris collection.' This is correct, as far as it goes; but is hardly adequate as a description of one of the most celebrated works of art in existence. This very cup is copied on a small scale and properly described by Mr. Purser, s.v. *Car-chesium*, and also mentioned with due recognition of its importance by Mr. Hamilton Smith, s.v. *Sculptura*, ii 608a. The 'Greek house at Delos' (i 659a), which was brought into existence by a blunder in Guhl and Koner, has been duly demolished by Mr. Tarbell in the *Classical Review* (March 1891, p. 130). Delos is a mistake for *Cnidus*: the only ancient house which the traveller can now see at Delos is a structure of Roman times. Those who have visited the island will have their suspicions further aroused by the 'Gate at Delos,' mentioned (s.v. *Porta*) under the head of 'Gates in ancient Greek walls'; and they will readily identify the cut as being none other than an inaccurate representation (from Reber's *Baukunst*, fig. 145, and ultimately from Blouet's *Morée* iii 11, 3) of what is commonly called the 'Cave Temple of Apollo.' It is inadequately described as a 'gate in a wall,' being really the portal of a primitive temple that fills a small ravine opening out on a terrace more than halfway up the rugged slopes of Cynthus. It is correctly figured in M. Lebégue's *Recherches sur Delos*, figs. 1 and 2 (both reproduced in Schreiber's *Bilderatlas*, I xi 1-3, and fig. 1 in Professor Jebb's admirable monograph on Delos in *J.H.S.*, i 42).

The number of misprints and slips of the pen that I have noticed in these volumes is remarkably small. In the article on *ροπίματος διαφθοράς γραφή*, the second word is twice misprinted, *Diaphoras* and *διαφοράς*. Under *Phalerae*, the name of the place where certain important specimens described by Otto Jahn were discovered, appears twice as *Lanersfort* instead of *Lauersfort*; and the author of an important work on the equipment of Roman soldiers is printed *Lindenschmidt* instead of *Lindenschmit*. Again, *Aizani* (ii 815b and 823a) is not in

Cilicia, but in Phrygia, and on the former page the reference to Vitruvius (on ἡχεῖα) should be i 1, 9 and v 5. Lastly, in the article on *φυλοβασιλείς*, we are told that 'we have no information as regards their number'; and it is considered 'not unreasonable to infer' that the number was four. But, even previously to the discovery of the *Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία*, it was known, through the quotation from it in Photius, s.v. *ναυκραρία*, that four was the number, and a passage in Pollux (viii 111) had been corrected accordingly by altering an unintelligible *δε* into an intelligible *δ*, to indicate that number.

The new evidence from the *Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία* is added in an Appendix containing a series of supplementary articles mainly by Mr. Wayte and Dr. Hager. The greatest care has evidently been bestowed on this supplementary matter, which enables us to gain a comprehensive view of the points in which the treatise confirms or corrects our previous knowledge. The only slips I have observed are on ii p. 1068*b*, where we are told that the *ἐπιμελητής τῶν ἰδμάτων* is mentioned in *Ἀθ. πολ.* c. 43, whereas the title there is *ὁ τῶν κρηνῶν ἐπιμελητής*. It is added that this *ἐπιμελητής* is apparently not mentioned elsewhere, though, as a matter of fact, *κρηνῶν ἐπιμεληταί* are mentioned by Aristotle in the *Politics*, 1321*b* 26, in a passage where Athens is doubtless in the author's mind, though not expressly named. Again, on p. 1070*a*, it is suggested that the law referred to at the end of c. 16 originally ran as fol-

lows: *ἐάν τις ἐπὶ τυραννίδι ἐπανιστήται ἢ συγκαθίστη τὴν τυραννίδα, ἀτιμὸν εἶναι αὐτὸν καὶ τὸ γένος*. It is then added that 'probably in the *Ἀθ. πολ.*' (presumably the passage as above restored) 'the word *τυραννεῖν* was written above *ἐπὶ τυραννίδι* and a copyist inserted the phrase lower down in the text.' This apparently means that *τυραννεῖν* displaced *ἐπὶ τυραννίδι* and the latter was thereupon transferred to the next clause, thus accounting for the order of the words in the MS., *τυραννεῖν* in the first clause being followed by *ἐπὶ τυραννίδι* after *ἢ* in the second; but the suggestion might perhaps have been expressed with greater clearness.

These however are but trifling flaws in a work on which a vast amount of learning and labour has been lavished by some of the ablest scholars in the United Kingdom. The price of the work in its present form necessarily puts it out of the reach of many students; but it will be duly valued by scholars both at home and abroad. Its high standard of general excellence can hardly fail to ensure its finding the place which it amply deserves in every reference-library in the United Kingdom and across the Atlantic; while, on the continent, it will no longer be possible (even accidentally) to ignore its existence in future editions of the *Bibliographie der klassischen Wissenschaft*, the publication of which has laid scholars throughout the world under a new obligation to Professor Emil Hübner.

J. E. SANDYS.

**Valerii Maximi Factorum et Dictorum Memorabilium Libri Novem.** Cum Iulii Paridis et Ianuarii Nepotiani Epitomis. Iterum recensuit CAROLUS KEMPF. Leipzig: Teubner. 1888.

IN the thirty-four years which have intervened between the first recension of the text by Dr. Kempf and this, his latest work, one finds comparatively few contributions to the study of Valerius Maximus. The one brilliant exception is, of course, the edition by Halm; but, this apart, there is little that is worth recalling. A few somewhat speculative suggestions by Elschen, Gelbeke, and by Kempf himself, and some emendations of the Paridian epitome by Du Rieu, are really all that any one will readily remember. Hence, in taking up the present volume, it is with the work of Halm alone that we most naturally compare it, with an interested recollection of the very pungent criticism that Kempf's earlier recension called forth from the by no means unwilling pen of the rival editor.

Halm's introduction to the text was in fact not more noteworthy for the learning and felicitous acuteness of some of his conjectures than for the very summary though courteous exploitation of the shortcomings of the earlier edition, of which, it will be remembered, he marshalled a formidable list, some

indeed—particularly those involving errors of transcription and orthography—being sufficiently obvious to have attracted the attention of a much less practised eye; and it cannot be said that Halm passed them over with a particularly gentle touch. Therefore, perhaps the most interesting feature of Kempf's final recension, and one that all who remember the controversy of 1865 will turn to with the greatest curiosity, is his reply to the strictures of Halm, now answered after that scholar's death and after the lapse of more than twenty years.

That the reply should be temperate and kindly in its tone was a thing to be expected, both from the circumstances of the case and because the old *furor grammaticus* that raged so merrily from Salmasius to Nauck has now gone out of fashion. What one might perhaps less confidently have looked for, is the very free and frank confession of the errors both of commission and omission in his former edition—errors for which he asks indulgence because due to lack of experience in manuscript collation. Students of Valerius Maximus would probably find it easy to overlook much greater slips than those for which their leniency is invoked, remembering as they do the peculiar difficulties presented by the Bern manuscript, with its numerous and exasperating erasures, its com-



plex and inconsistent corrections by the three later scribes, and the other interpolations of uncertain date and authorship. The reviser of the text, however cautious he may be, can scarcely expect to escape the animadversion of his successors. It is thus that Kempf retaliates upon Halm with an attack that is of the true *tu quoque* sort. Halm had spent much time in Bern in careful study of the codex; his friend Wilmanns had personally made for him a list of readings from the Vatican MS.; yet notwithstanding all this care, Kempf, who has been allowed to borrow the Swiss codex, finds it an easy matter to show instances of oversight on the part of Halm no less obvious, though much less numerous, than those which exposed his own recension to criticism. Some of the corrections in the present edition are worth mentioning, e.g. in the passage i. 6. 2, where Kempf's old reading from the Bern codex (*concionante se iunxit*) was overlooked by Halm, who noted *\*clu\*it*, conjecturing *clucit*, which Kempf himself has now accepted; in iv. 7. ext. 1, where Halm had, apparently in despair, adopted the conjecture of Foertsch, *et hora a Dionysio constituta veniam qui acceperat supervenit*, but where Kempf now establishes Madvig's reading *et eam qui acceperat supervenit*, i.e. *et hora supervenit et eam qui acceperat*, though for convenience of reading this is hardly as good as that of C. B. Hase, *qui eam acceperat*; and in vi. 7. 3, in which Halm incorrectly read *prosequetur*, noting *sequetur* from B, but ignoring the *persequetur* of Kempf, which is from the *psequetur* of the Bern codex (the first hand).

On the whole, however, it cannot be truly said that the corrections and additions to the work of Halm are sufficient to impair the authority of the text that scholars have now been using for two decades; and it is perhaps not too much to say that some of Kempf's alterations in his own former readings are distinctly no improvement, substituting as they occasionally do an unintelligible for a quite intelligible lection. A good instance of this is afforded by the much disputed passage (v. 3. ext. 3) which Kempf in his recension of 1854 gave in the body of the text as doubtful, but cleverly suggested the reading *vix vitalis vita hominum* from Cic. *Lael.* 6. 22 *cui potest esse vita vitalis* etc., without, however, clearing up the difficulty involved in the following *exeret*, for which, it may be remarked, the Torrenian edition reads *exstat*. Halm's admirable remarks on this passage (Praef. xvi.) amounted, it may be remembered, to a demonstration, proving beyond question that the *hominum exar extollit* cited by Kempf from the Vienna codex was a pure misreading of *hominum exar et tollit* i.e. *hominum exstaret* (= esset). In the present edition, Kempf alters his own text, if anything, for the worse, and clearly sins against logic in permitting such an impossible reading to stand as *beneficium commercium sine quo vix vita hominum exeret tollit*, which he himself marks with an asterisk. At times he has allowed the most unsatisfactory of his former readings to stand such as *itaque qui amara suggillatione* of vi. 9. 12; while the best of the corrections noticeable in the new text are really those of Halm, e.g. *catenatae cervicis totius tunc fori ora clausserunt* vi. 2. 3), or of Madvig, who furnishes what is perhaps the best of all the emendations, in the well-known passage over which so many editors have given way to despair (vii. 2. ext. 10), but which is now made beautifully simple by the reading *a caritate istud pater, ab usu Philippus*, etc., in place of Halm's *avus o Philippus*, as given by the Vienna codex.

H. T. PECK.

Columbia College.

NO. XLVI. VOL. V.

**D. Junii Juvenalis Satira Septima.** Texte Latin, publié avec un Commentaire critique, explicatif, et historique, par J. A. HILD, Professeur à la faculté des Lettres de Poitiers. Paris, Klincksieck, 1890. 3 fres.

A gracefully written exposition, which, although offering and professing to offer little that is new, will be found useful to students and attractive to literary readers. The editor has grappled conscientiously with the difficulties of the text, and intersperses very sensible remarks on the weakness of the composition, which he justly regards as inferior to that of several other of Juvenal's pieces. One error should be mentioned. On pages 30 and 32 the *Lectioes Ausonianae* are attributed to Julius Caesar (J. C. and C.) Scaliger insted of to Joseph Justus.

H. N.

**De Apulei Quae fertur Physiognomia recensenda et emendenda.** Scripsit RICHARDUS FOERSTER. Leipzig, 1887. 1 Mk. 20.

THIS essay (thirty pages in length) is reprinted separately from the supplement to Jahn's *Jahrbücher*. Foerster begins by denying, quite rightly, that the *Physiognomia* edited by Valentine Rose can be the work of Apuleius of Madaura. The Latin style alone is sufficient to put this hypothesis out of court. He proceeds to discuss afresh the relations of the existing manuscripts to their lost archetype, and then gives a series of emendations, based partly on the Greek of Adamantius, partly on independent conjecture. A considerable number of these will probably be accepted. The following are suggested as possible improvements. Apuleius p. 117 l *pupillae oculorum iactantes et porrectae vanitatem delegunt*. *Iactantes* cannot be right, as some word is wanted corresponding to *εἰρήνης* in the Greek, and Foerster therefore proposes *late patentes*. Perhaps *lātescentes*. P. 122 8 *niger* (so Foerster rightly for *senister*) *circulus si fuerit rubens in unidis oculis.....magnanimum hominem et sapientem.....declarat, iuxta pueros*. Foerster proposes in *pueros dementem*. But *iuxta* in this Latin may mean 'with regard to.' Ti. Donatus on *Aen.* 4. 371 *tanta mala iuxta me commissa sunt*: ib. *Aen.* 5. 6 *aliquid mali.....iuxta salutem Didonis esse commissum*: Faustus Reiensis *Epist.* p. 6 *iuxta substantiam Dei.....scriptum*. The true correction may perhaps be *iuxta pueros [furiosum]*: or, if *iuxta* be an adverb, *iuxta puerorum, puerorum* being formed on the analogy of *virosus* and *multi-cerosus*.

H. N.

**The Evagoras of Isocrates**, with an introduction and notes by HENRY CLARKE, M.A. Swan Sonnenschein and Co. 2s. 6d.

THE notes in this edition are sufficiently full, and instructive and profitable both with regard to the language and subject-matter. It may be regretted that no notes are given to the *Ἰπὸθεσις*, an interesting piece of ancient literary criticism, possessing some interest and demanding some explanation. I note but few and unimportant omissions in the notes on the text. To the note on *καὶ οὐκ* in § 2 might be added a reference to § 65. On § 7 (*ὕπερβλλον*) add reference for the active to § 13, for the middle to § 41. On the same section it might be noted that the agent with *δουλευτόν* is expressed in the accus. rather than the dative because the dative might be mistaken for the indirect object after *δουλευτόν*. (Similarly in the passage xvii. 56 cited in the note on § 75 we have the accusative *μενημένους* rather than the genitive, to avoid collision with the genitive *τοῦτων* that follows it.) On § 8 a reference should be given to Dr.

H H

Thompson's Excursus to the *Phaedrus* "On the Philosophy of Isocrates." In the note on comparative adverbs (§ 34) the form *φιλοτιμοτέρως* at § 5 might be cited, and the statement that the forms in *-ως* are commoner than the forms in *-ον* should be limited to Isocrates. On § 47 (*ἀπολελείφθαι*) add reference to § 79. The editor follows the good practice of illustrating his author chiefly from his own writings; but it would be useful to have a list of the titles of the speeches corresponding to the Roman numerals by which they are cited; a student would hardly gather that the 'ix. 61' in this note was a reference to the work before him.

The following notes appear to contain questionable points: § 18 '*ποιήσας*, not *ποιῶν*, since the choice of the name preceded the foundation of the city': § 38 '*καὶ τούτων* 'on this account also,' dependent on *ἐπαινεσείαν*'; but does not *τούτων* depend on *μᾶλλον*, 'more than even Cyrus'? § 64 the note on *ὁὸς τε* is not clear; moreover *καὶ ὅς* in Homer is not equivalent to *ὅς τε*, and the transition from the demonstrative to the relative meaning of *ὅς* was probably independent of the influence of particles like *τε* or *καὶ*.

The number of misprints is undesirably great. I note in the text: p. 13, 11th line from bottom, *τῷ* for *τῷ*; p. 14, 8th line from top, *Εγκομιον* for *ἐγκώμιον*; p. 17, 9th line from bottom, *νομιζοντες*: 5 lines lower delete comma after *ἐκείνόν*; p. 22, 8th line from bottom, *αὐτοσχεδιάζειν*: next line, *ζητεῖν*; p. 23, 7th line, *ἡκουεν*: p. 25, line 20, *νόμῳ* for *νόμῳ*; p. 29, line 5, *μήμην*: line 19, *ὕστεριζω*. The most important misprint in the notes is on p. 57, where § 66 is numbered § 65, and in consequence the summary of §§ 65—72 is put one section too late.

Mr. Clarke complains that Isocrates is too much neglected in English schools and colleges. For this no doubt we must partly blame the bluntness of our English ears, almost insensible to time and rhythm in speech, and thereby incapable of appreciating the chief beauty of Isocrates. But perhaps other causes militating against his popularity may be found in the author himself. Such are his absolute want of sense of humour and his indifference to historical truth. The resulting impression of insincerity and artificiality in his author the student can hardly escape. Was not Plato after all right in seeing something conventional and even vulgar in the man who could write (see § 40) *οὐν δ' ἅπαντες ἂν ὁμολογήσειαν τυραννίδα καὶ τῶν θείων ἀγαθῶν καὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων μέγιστον καὶ σεμνότερον καὶ περιμαχητότατον εἶναι*?

E. S. THOMPSON.

**Sabrinæ Corolla.** Editio Quarta. (G. Bell and Sons.) 10s. 6d.

THE three original editors of *Sabrinæ Corolla* have all passed away, but the last survivor Dr. Kennedy has not only enriched the fourth edition with numerous specimens of his own work, but, as we learn from the preface, was employed almost up to the day of his death in revising and correcting it.

Dr. Holden, who succeeded Mr. James Riddell as joint editor of the third edition, has brought out the present edition in conjunction with Mr. Archer-Hind. It is practically a new book; many of the old pieces have disappeared, those which reappear have been often emended, and the amount of fresh matter is such that, though much has been withdrawn, the new volume is at least double the size of its predecessor.

Between the second and fourth edition we have lost four scholars of the highest class all educated at Shrewsbury, Mr. Shilleto, Mr. Munro, Canon Evans and Dr. Kennedy, not to speak of Mr. Paley and Mr. W. G. Clark: and their work has been largely incorporated in the present edition.

There are 14 new pieces by Canon Evans, 15 by Mr. Shilleto, 31 by Mr. Munro and no less than 108 by Dr. Kennedy, who has however withdrawn 56 which appeared in earlier editions.

The engravings have been omitted; the opening poem 'Sabrina fair,' originally ascribed to the three Editors, is with slight alterations assigned to Dr. Kennedy.

His most ambitious contribution to the book is a translation of Gray's 'Elegy' in Hexameters, but he is far more successful in shorter pieces, especially happy in epigrams. Whether the nymph of a grotto or big fleas or a proposal to lay down gas-pipes is the subject, he is equally at home. A version of 'Ye mariners of England' in Alcaics is rather spoilt by pauses at the end of the first line of the stanza, and perhaps the British oak can hardly be the ilex. If Horace is to be our authority for Lyrics, 'senseris aevo' should not end a Sapphic stanza (the same objection by the way may be made to 'qua nisis arces veneris igneus' of Mr. Holmes, page 245). One regrets to see so great a composer lend his authority to poemum' (it is true it occurs in a sacred poem) and to the use of 'quando' for 'cum' (page 21), though doubtless he would have chapter and verse for each. In this use of 'quando' he has Mr. Munro's authority at any rate, but Mr. Munro's vast reading and consummate knowledge of Latin led him into eccentricities, from which the limited study of the writers of the Augustan age would have saved a man of less erudition.

What is to be said of 'Qua, Nymphae, fueratis?' or of the use of 'hic in three several elegiac poems, or of 'suprema sequi vestigia fortis' for 'the brave man's latest steps to trace'? Is 'omnia nequiquam!' good Latin? In the translation of the well-known passage of Milton entitled here 'War in Heaven' the following passage occurs:—

'Visum excussit atrox retrorsum horrore, sed ursit terga tamen longè pejus: de margine caeli dant se præcipites: ast ira aeterna flagravat ad cassum fundo post illos usque barathrum.'

The lines that follow have a rugged grandeur of their own, but those quoted though astonishingly close to the original are surely portentous, and produce the same effect on the reader as the sight of 'that spacious gap in the wasteful deep' produces on the rebel angels. When Mr. Munro avowedly imitates Lucretius he is in his element. When he aims at Virgil he is haunted by reminiscences of Lucretian rhythm and usage, and the result is a hybrid. His work is always deeply interesting and passages of rare beauty and felicity occur, but they are always marred by some jarring notes which confound the harmony. May one protest against *Δογλῆς* for Douglas?

Mr. Shilleto's new pieces are chiefly Greek and experiments in metre, but the best is the passage from the 'Merry Wives,' in which Justice Shallow enlarges on the antiquity of his coat of arms. The following epigram preserves happily the play on words:—

'Thy praise or dispraise is to me alike,  
One doth not stroke me, nor the other strike.'

'Culpæ dignum an laude me putas? neutrum  
Moramur: hæc non mulcet, illa non mulcat.'

But of past masters in the art there is no one perhaps whose new contributions are so uniformly good as those of Canon Evans, and he is equally successful in all metres. It may be doubted however whether 'plagam opimam' can mean 'a noble stroke.'

The other contributors old and new have combined to raise the standard of the work to a higher pitch of excellence than before, and many pieces of great merit have been rejected to make room for better.

One piece by W.G.C. has been retained from the 'Lotus Eaters' (page 355) which should have been sacrificed.

In Greek verse Mr Archer-Hind fully maintains the old character of his school; and is equally strong in Elegiacs and Iambics. In a fine passage (page 387), a translation of Tennyson's 'The Revenge,' are two false prints—*ἀπέρμον* for *ἀτέρμον* and *ἦμιν* for *ἡμιν*. While on this subject it may be as well to note accents misprinted for breathings (pages 115 and 261) and *αὐτός* for *αὐτός* (page 159) 'caram' for 'earam' (page 305) and 'florens' for 'floreus' (page 389). Is it lawful to disregard 'synaphea' in anapaests, except after the paroemiac verse? If not *τῆς πολυβούλου ἐν δε γερόντων* will be incorrect at page 87.

The first part concludes, as it began, with 'Sabrina fair' translated beautifully into Alcaics, and is followed by Carmina Sacra, most of them written by Dr. Kennedy and Canon Evans, but containing a fine elegiac copy by Mr Burn.

In conclusion the advice to be given to possessors and non-possessors of the old volume may be briefly expressed thus:—

'hunc emat qui nescit illum, quique novit hunc emat.'

E. D. S.

PROFESSOR GEORGES'S *Lexicon der Lateinischen Wortformen* was completed last year. It consists of nineteen parts, making up (with a short supplement) a volume of nearly 800 pages. For students who wish for the latest information on the forms of Latin words in a compendious form, the book, though not professing to be exhaustive, will be found extremely valuable: the more so, as the venerable lexicographer has had the assistance of several distinguished specialists.

H. N.

#### The Burial Customs of the Ancient Greeks.

By FRANK P. GRAVES, A.B. Pp. 17. Brooklyn (U.S.A.): Roche and Hawkins, 1891.

In this unpretending thesis for the M.A. degree at the University School of Philosophy at Columbia College, the writer has attempted to collect the material, literary and monumental, bearing upon his subject, and to give a simple narrative based thereon. The subjects treated, in successive chapters, are: the duty of burial, burials extraordinary (criminals, suicides, etc.), preparation for burial, lying in state, outward grief, the procession, burning and inhumation, coffins, tombs, the funeral feast, sacrifices at the grave, further ceremonies (the *genesia*, *nekysia*, etc.). Most of the writer's data are taken at second or third hand; there is a sad lack of criticism in his treatment of his authorities, and his pages bristle with vexatious misprints. He would have done well to heed the Horatian maxim, truer even for the scholar than for the poet: he forgets that *nescit vox missa reverti*.

## NOTES.

Πολλοὶ καὶ ἄλλοι.—The circumstances under which *καὶ* is used or omitted between *πολλοὶ* and another adjective are familiar; but it is assumed by some that in this respect *ἄλλοι* is like other adjectives. In one of the most recent works published in America, the beginner is repeatedly directed to "say 'many and other'" in writing Greek. So in L. and S., under *πολύς* we find cited as an instance Hes. *Th.* 363 *πολλὰ γὰρ μὲν εἰσι καὶ ἄλλα*. This is from Passow, who adds 'und eben so bei Hdt. und Att.' But the context shows plainly that *καὶ* here meant 'also'; and in all the examples of *πολλοὶ καὶ ἄλλοι* that I have observed *καὶ* may have this meaning and in most cases *must* have it. The true usage, when *ἄλλοι* is not emphatic, is seen in Hes. *O. et D.* 37 *ἄλλα τε πολλὰ ἄρπάζων ἐφόρει*. The tendency to use *καὶ*, 'also,' before *ἄλλος* is well-known. Compare the following: Hom. *Od.* ii. 209 *Ἐδρύμαξ' ἦδ' καὶ ἄλλοι, ὅσοι μνηστῆρες ἄγαυοί, ἰ. 394 ἄλλ' ἦτοι βασιλῆες Ἀχαιῶν εἰσὶ καὶ ἄλλοι | πολλοί, ἰ. 354 f. οὐ γὰρ Ὀδυσσεὺς οἷος ἀπώλεσε νόστιμον ἦμαρ | ἐν Τροίῃ, πολλοὶ δὲ καὶ ἄλλοι ὥφτες ὄλοντο*. It is obvious that the sense in the last verse is *όλοντο* δὲ καὶ ἄλλοι πολλοί. In like manner compare *Il.* iv. 538 *πολλοὶ δὲ περὶ κτείνοντο καὶ ἄλλοι* with *Il.* xiii. 312 *ἦνυσθ' ἐν μέσσοις ἀμύνει εἰσὶ καὶ ἄλλοι*. So with *Il.* xxi. 88 compare *Il.* xiii. 229, xviii. 106, xxii. 350, xxiv. 484. For *πολλοὶ ἄλλοι* and *ἄλλοι πολλοί* without *καὶ* see *Od.* i. 176 f., 337, iii. 113 (with which compare *ii.* 166). The usage of the Attic poets is the same, as Aesch. *Supp.* 960 *πολλῶν μετ' ἄλλων*, Soph. *Ant.* 506 *πολλὰ τ' ἄλλ' εὐδαιμονεῖ*, Eur. *Andr.* 1152 *πολλῶν μετ' ἄλλων*, 992

*πολλοῖσιν ἄλλοις κτέ.*, Ar. *Equ.* 735 *ἄλλοι τε πολλοὶ καὶ καλοὶ τε κάγαθοι*.

Prose authors exhibit the same usage, as Hdt. i. 1 *ἄλλας τε πολλὰς καὶ δὴ καὶ τοῦ βασιλέως θυγατέρα*, with which compare iii. 20 *νόμοισι δὲ καὶ ἄλλοις χρᾶσθαι αὐτοῦς φασί...καὶ δὴ καὶ κτέ.*, and *πολλοῖσι μὲν καὶ ἄλλοις τεκμηρίοις πάρεστι σταθμίσσασθαι, ἐν δὲ δὴ καὶ τῷδε*. Compare also iii. 15 and 125. In Thucydides there are eleven instances without *καὶ*: i. 38. 3, 139. 4, ii. 65. 7, 70. 1, iv. 50. 2, vi. 6. 3, viii. 64. 3, 74. 3, 82. 1, 86. 3, 96. 4, not counting iv. 72. 3 *ἄλλους τινὰς οὐ πολλούς*; and eight with *καὶ*, 'also': i. 6. 4, 20. 4, 144. 1, ii. 51. 1, iii. 56. 1, vi. 44. 1, vii. 25. 6, viii. 53. 2. In Xenophon examples without *καὶ* abound, as *An.* ii. 5. 1, *Cyrop.* iv. 3. 13, etc. Plato uses *ἄλλοι πολλοί* very often, as *Euthyph.* 6 B, C, *Apol.* 21 C, E, 32 C, 34 A, C, *Crit.* 45 B, *Phaedo* 96 C, 98 C, 104 A, 109 B, 111 A, 112 A, *Crat.* 384 C, 392 A, 397 B, 398 B, 410 A, 414 D, 415 C, *Phaedr.* 267 (*ἄλλα πολλὰ καὶ καλά*), *et passim*; sometimes *πολλοὶ ἄλλοι*, as *Phileb.* 55 B. Plato uses emphatic *καὶ* rather sparingly, as *Prot.* 352 E, *πολλὰ γὰρ οἶμαι καὶ ἄλλα οὐκ ὀρθῶς λέγουσιν*, with which compare *Apol.* 30 C *μέλλω γὰρ οὖν ἔττα ὅμιν εἶρεν καὶ ἄλλα*, 'also some other things.' Likewise in the orators we usually find *ἄλλοι πολλοί*, as *Andoc.* i. 140, *Lys.* xii. 48, *Isoc.* iii. 22, iv. 21, *Lycurg.* 35, *Hyper.* iii. 1 (Blass, p. 35, col. 2), *Dem.* xxiii. 63, xxiv. 136; sometimes, of course, *πολλοὶ ἄλλοι*, as *Dem.* xxx. 6; and *πολλοὶ καὶ ἄλλοι* when occasion demands, as *Lys.* x. 20, *Dem.* xxvii. 53, xxix. 50.

The usage is the same when the much rarer *ἑτεροί*

H H 2

is employed, as (ἑτεροι πολλοί) Antipho vi. 24, Andoc. i. 101, Dinarch. i. 111, ii. 2, and (πολλοί ἑτεροι) Andoc. i. 103. I do not remember to have met with πολλοί καὶ ἑτεροι.

Since the Greeks said πολλή καὶ καλὴ ἐλπίς (χώρα, etc.) it may be worth while to note ἄλλην πολλὴν φλυσιαν, Plat. *Apol.* 19 C.

The examples cited form but a small part of what I have observed, but they include all the peculiarities I noted. The list from Thucydides is exhaustive, thanks to von Essen; but the rest were picked up at random, and of course the conclusions arrived at can only be provisional. An example in Thucydides (ii. 51. 1) is the only one I have observed where one would reasonably be disposed to render πολλὰ καὶ ἄλλα simply 'many other'; but when we consider the fondness of the author for brachylogy, it seems more probable that πολλὰ καὶ ἄλλα παραλιπόντι ἀτοπίας means 'to omit also many other strange characteristics' in the sense of 'there being also many other strange characteristics which I omit.'

Since, then, ἄλλοι πολλοί is very common, and πολλοί ἄλλοι not rare, and ἄλλοι καὶ πολλοί seems not to occur, and since in πολλοί καὶ ἄλλοι the sense 'also' is often demanded and (so far as observed) always appropriate, we conclude that certainly the normal, and probably the universal, usage was not to connect πολλοί with ἄλλοι or ἑτεροι, as with ordinary adjectives of quality, by means of a conjunction.

This fact seems reasonable. They said πολλοί καὶ καλοί, but ἄλλοι καλοί: hence they would consistently say ἄλλοι πολλοί καὶ καλοί and ἄλλοι πολλοί. In other words, πολὺς was coordinate with ordinary adjectives and ἄλλος was not; hence πολὺς and ἄλλος were not coordinate with each other. Sometimes the emphatic καί has the appearance of connecting ἄλλος with ordinary adjectives (other than πολὺς), as Xen. *Cyrop.* iv. 2. 28 (after an enumeration of things done by the enemy) οἰεσθαι δὲ δεῖ πολλὰ τε καὶ παντοδαπὰ καὶ ἄλλα ποιεῖν αὐτούς, πλὴν ἐμάχετο οὐδεὶς. But in fact the sense here is the same as it would be in ποιεῖν αὐτούς καὶ ἄλλα πολλὰ τε καὶ παντοδαπὰ. The words καὶ ἄλλα, as often happens, are merely brought near the verb. Compare the following with each other: Hdt. vi. 114 τοῦτο δὲ ἄλλοι Ἀθηναίων πολλοί τε καὶ οὐνομαστοί (the verb has gone before), v. 102 καὶ πολλοὺς αὐτῶν οἱ Πέρσαι φονεύουσι ἄλλους τε οὐνομαστούς, ἐν δὲ δὴ καὶ Εὐαλκίδην, Thuc. i. 38. 3 πολλὰ ἐς ἡμᾶς ἄλλα τε ἡμαρτήκασι καὶ Ἐπιδαμνον... ἐλόντες βία ἔχουσιν, Xen. *Cyrop.* ii. 3. 16 ἀνίσταντο δὲ καὶ ἄλλοι πολλοὶ συναγορεύοντες, Thuc. i. 6. 4 πολλὰ δ' ἂν καὶ ἄλλα ἀποδείξειε κτέ. I close with an example which well illustrates the force I ascribe to καί in all cases: Thuc. i. 20. 4 πολλὰ δὲ καὶ ἄλλα ἐτι καὶ νῦν ὄντα καὶ οὐ χρόνῳ ἀμνηστούμενα καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι: Ἕλληες οὐκ ὀρθῶς οἰοῦνται κτέ.

MILTON W. HUMPHREYS.  
University of Virginia.

\* \*

SCHOLIA ON THE 'ELECTRA' OF EURIPIDES.—During a recent visit to Florence I examined the Laurentian MS. usually called C (Library classing xxxii. 2) and noted the following marginal and interlinear comments on the *Electra* of Euripides, which do not appear among those given by Weil in his valuable edition of the play (1879).

44. ἦσυχον εὐνή] Marginal note γράφεται ἦσυχον' εὐνή, which should doubtless be ἦσυχον' ἐν εὐνῇ.

102. ἔως] ἥως is interlined to show that ἔως is here a substantive not a conjunction.

140. θες τότε τεύχος ἐμῆς ἀπὸ κρατὸς ἐλοῦσ'] Marginal note πρὸς ταύτην τοῦτο φησὶ ἡ ἤλέκτρα ἀφελοῦσα.

649. ὑπηρετεῖται μὲν δοῦν ὄντων τόδε] Above the line after τόδε is the note ἔγγουν τὸ τῆς τέχης. Weil and other editors follow Tyrwhitt in reading ἔδε for τόδε.

805. Νύμφαι πετραῖαι, πολλάκις με βουθυτεῖν] δότε is written after βουθυτεῖν above the line, as an explanation of the construction, and in the margin is the note πολλάκις λείπει τὸ δότε.

819. δωρίδ' ἀρπάσας] Marginal note εἰδός τι μαχαίρας ἢ (sic) δωρίς. Nauck reads δωρίδ' ἀναρπάσας.

873. σὺ μὲν νῦν] The MS. reads σὺ μὲν νῦν with δὴ written over νῦν. The μὲν is accented as if the enclitic νῦν followed and the gloss δὴ points to this reading, which is moreover required both by metre and sense (assuming the distinction of meaning commonly adopted between νῦν and νυν to be correct).

924. παρ' οἱ] Marginal note παρ' αὐτῶ, doubtless a mistake for παρ' αὐτῶ.

961. σφαγῆς πάροιθε μὴ εἰσῆδη νεκρόν] Marginal note μὴ πρὸ τοῦ σφαγῆσαι εἰσῆδη τὸν τοῦ αἰγίσθου νεκρόν. Μὴ εἰσῆδη given above is Barnes' correction of the MS. μ' εἰσῆδη.

975. φείδεμαι] Marginal note κατηγορηθῶμαι i.e. κατηγορηθήσομαι.

976. καὶ μὴ γ' ἀμύνων] The MS. has καὶ μὴν with μὴ written above by second hand. Weil and other editors follow the conjecture of Reiske in printing καὶ μὴ, but do not indicate MS. authority for that reading.

979. ἀρ' αὐτ' ἀλδστωρ] Marginal note αὐτὸ τὸ ἄλ. The gloss συνίχησις is found above the following words, 196 θεούς, 744 and 1234 θεῶν.

The gloss ἀντὶ μᾶς, which means that the two syllables referred to in each case (marked thus — below) are metrically equivalent to one, occurs on 134 ἀδελεφεῖν, 445 the second ἀνὰ (it corresponds to the second syllable of ἔπαλλε in line 435), 725 χρυσόμαλλον, 726 the second τότε, 732 θεοτύρην, 744 θεραπείας, 1156 πῶσιν (the contraction is necessary because the MS. does not contain ἐν, which most modern editors insert before λουτροῖς in line 1148. Weil has changed the order of the words in this passage).

Σημειοῦ or σημειώσαι, i.e. nota bene, is written opposite lines 80, 290, 294, 368, 422, 523, 902, 932, 954, 1013, 1131, and the word γνῶμη in the margin calls attention to the sententious character of lines 941, 958, 1084.

The words σημειοῦ or σημειώσαι and γνῶμη, as well as γράφεται quoted above on line 44, appear in the MS. in contracted forms.

When the metre changes, its name is given in the margin by a later hand, in large characters, written with dark ink, as follows:—ιαμβικοί 1, 213, 487, 596, 751, 866, 880, 998, 1238. ιαμβικά καὶ τροχαικά 1165. χοριαμβικά 112, 432. ἀνapaιστικά 988, 1233, 1292. ἀντισπαστικοί 585. ἀντισπαστικά 1147. χοριαμβικά καὶ ἀνapaιστικά 699, 859. ὁμοια τοῖς ἄνω 873 (i.e. lines 873 to 879 are same metre as 859 to 865).

ἐμφθός is written at 476 and 1163, σύνθημα (referring doubtless to the preceding lines) after 865 and 879.

Neither capitals nor large letters existed in the MS. originally, either at the beginning of proper names or elsewhere, but a later hand has rewritten the first letter of important sections in a larger size. The original small letter can still, for the most part, be traced under the darker ink used by the later hand.

Proper names are often distinguished by a short line above them, thus:—ἀγαμέμνων. The usage however is not consistent, the same name appearing sometimes with the line, sometimes without it.



With a few exceptions (due perhaps to a later insertion) a subscript does not occur either in the text or marginal notes.

In verbal terminations the forms in  $\eta$  ( $\rho$ ) are preferred to those in  $\epsilon$ .

CHARLES H. KEENE.

\* \*

#### NOTES ON SOME PASSAGES IN PROPERTIUS.

##### III. 24 (= II. 32 Palmer).

In vv. 5, 6 perhaps after all it is unnecessary to desert the MSS. At a time so eager for religious novelties, an impetus may well have been given to a cultus of Hercules as a patron of literature, when Marcus Philippus, uncle by marriage of the Emperor, restored the temple of Hercules Musagetes, the Aedes Herculis Musarum (v. end of the *Fusti*, and cf. Theoc. 24. 107). The temple at Tibur contained a good library in the days of Gellius (19. 5). As a poetess then (ii. 3, 21)—and *vates* is a word of religious import—Cynthia could find a flimsy pretext of religion for a visit to Tibur. She may be called *anus* in the next line just as in colloquial English a superstitious or over-scrupulous person might be called an old woman: cf. L. S. s.vv. *anus*, *anicula*, *anilis* and Dem. *De Cor.* 260 τὸν καλοῦν θιάσους ἄγων διὰ τῶν ὀδῶν... ἔταρχος... ὅτι τῶν γράβων προσ-αγορευόμενος. That women not literally γράβια were fond of the wilder rites we know from Aristophanes (*Lysist.* 387 sq.). 'Why,' asks Propertius, 'does the via Appia so often lead you to, see you pass over it in, superstitious rites?' The scorn implied in '*anus*' would be quite in harmony with his general attitude to religion, especially in its wilder forms. The rites would be those mentioned 9—10 which are recommended by Ovid *A. A.* i. 253 for their gatherings of women.

In v. 23 the MS. authority is for *de te nostra*, which is certainly better than the vulgate and perhaps unobjectionable: cf. *Phil.* ii. 28, 69, where B. and K. read *illam suam suas res sibi habere jussit*. There would be a touch of quasi-legal formality and verbiage in describing Cynthia as 'you, my, Propertius' mistress. Ad aures should be taken more closely with rumor than with laedit. The verbal force in rumor helps the construction. Otherwise we might read

—'nostras inlidunt aures.'

The change involved is slight palaeographically. For the (rare) construction cf. Plaut. *Stichus* 88

mihī paternae vocis sonitus aures accidit

and for the metaphor cf. the (weaker) ordinary expression *verberare*, *tundere aures*. *Inlidunt* would imply the vehemence of the gossip about Cynthia.

##### III. 26 (= II. 34).

v. 45 'non tutior ibis Homero' clearly refers to the story of Homer's love of Penelope. This we find in the fragment of Hermesianax (pupil of P.'s model Philetas); and, as there Antimachus' passion is related next but one to Homer's, Propertius may have had the passage before his mind. Deos (46) might then be a reminiscence of Hermesianax' θεῖος Ὀμηρος. In the same passage the εἰπεῖα τάρπις which Homer abandons for Ithaca cannot be Chios; it might be Lydia, but Athens would be more appropriate to the Penelope-story and εἰπεῖα might, in an Alexandrian, be sufficiently explained by *Od.* vii. 80 εἰδυμένην Ἀθήνῃν. In any case v. 29 in this elegy of Propertius is most easily intelligible if we understand Homer to be the 'Eretheus.' For the idea v. the well-known epigram: it was also entertained by grammarians, v. Monro, *Homeric Grammar* § 173, 2.

v. 71. The poma seem to be the apples and nuts

mea quas Amaryllis amabat, *Ecl.* ii. 52.

This cheap taste of Amaryllis seems to have caught the fancy of Virgil's contemporaries, cf. *Ov. A. A.* ii. 267, 8

Afferat aut uvae aut quas Amaryllis amabat;  
At nunc castaneas non amat illa nuces.

Cf. *ib.* iii. 18, 3.

In 72 is not *et gratiae* an improvement? 'Close-fisted Tityrus may woo her and she will even be grateful': the allusion is to *Ecl.* i. 30, 'postquam nos Amaryllis habet.'

It is easier to see how the whole passage 67—76 hangs together if we suppose that already as in later days (Apuleius *de Magia*, 10) Corydon in *Ecl.* ii. was supposed to represent Virgil himself.

IV. 3 (= III. 3).

In v. 29 *ergo* seems to derive sufficient force from the fact that 'museum' was the name of such a place as the two preceding lines described, v. Pliny *N. H.* 36, 42 on *pumices*. 'Appellantur quidem ita et erosa saxa, in aedificiis quae musea vocant, dependentia ad imaginem specus arte reddenda.'

IV. 7 (= III. 7).

v. 60. Perhaps *longae manus* are hands with long lines on the palms—a sign of longevity, according to Aristotle, v. Pliny *N. H.* 11, 114 and Bonitz Index s.v. *χεῖρ* 5. The couplet means 'Why did you destroy me in my youth? I was designed to have a long life.'

V. (IV.) 5.

v. 34. *Sideris* may be defended by the probability that Saturday was the only day yet known to the Romans by the name of a planet. To be able to attend the Sabbath services she would have to avoid uncleanness which lasted until the evening after coenabit, *Levit.* xv. 18. That many women attended at the Sabbath services we know from Ovid *A. A.* i. 76.

C. M. MULVANY.

\* \*

TISIDIUM.—The negotiations of the winter of B.C. 109–108, which had led to the partial submission of Jugurtha, broke off when the point was reached at which his own surrender was demanded. Sallust *Jug.* 62, 8: *igitur Jugurtha, ubi armis virisque et pecunia spoliatus est, cum ipse ad imperandum Tisidium vocaretur, rursus coepit flectere animum suum* &c. Hitherto the identification of Tisidium has been given up. There can be little doubt however that Sallust means us to understand that it was the headquarters of Metellus, the place where he was wintering with part of the army (68, 2: *legionem cum qua hiemabat*) as distinguished from the winter-quarters of the rest (61, 1, 2), and therefore the scene of the *consilium* of 62, 4. If so we have a clue to its position, for from these winter-quarters of his Metellus made his dash on Vaga described in 68, 2: *legionem, cum qua hiemabat, pariter cum occasu solis expeditos educit et postero die circiter hora tertia pervenit in quandam planitiem* (which we learn was about a mile from Vaga). The march therefore took about fifteen hours, in which time we cannot suppose that a force with work to do at the end could cover more than forty miles at the outside, probably less. We ought therefore to look for Tisidium at a point between thirty and forty miles from Vaga.

The ruins at Krisch el Wéd (on the right bank of the Bagradas; see the map in *C.I.L.* viii.) have produced one inscription which gives the name of the town but in an imperfect form, *C.I.L.* viii. 1269, *MVNICIPES /HISIDVENSES*. On the authority

of the Tabula Peutingeriana and the Anonymus of Ravenna, who place at this point accurately enough a town which they call Chisiduo, this was restored as CHISIDVENSES. In 1887 H. de Villefosse published in the *Revue Archéologique* the following epitaph (now in *Ephemeris Epigraphica*, vii. 703) which there can be little doubt came from the well-known cemetery of the employés of the Fiscus at Carthage: *D.M.S. T. Aelius Augusti lib(ertus) Libycus adiut(or) tabul(aris) a[b] men(sa) Thisiduensi*. It was at once seen that Thisiduo was the real form of the name, and it has been so printed in the map attached to the seventh volume of the *Ephemeris*.

If the distance by road between Vaga and Thisiduo be measured on the map in *C.I.L.* viii. it will be found to be between thirty-five and forty miles. The Latinized form Tisidium will be no difficulty to those who are familiar with the trouble which African names always gave the Romans, especially when the country was strange to them in the early days of their occupation. (So the author of the *Bellum Africanum* calls Thyssrus, Tisdra.) It is a small confirmation that the place selected by Metellus for his headquarters should have retained sufficient importance to become one of the four local centres of the fiscal *trachus Karthaginensis* (i.e. the *mensa Thisiduensis* of the inscription).

G. MCN. RUSHFORTH.

\* \*

THE PRONUNCIATION OF SUIDAS.—In a notice of the English edition of Seyffert's *Dictionary of Classical Antiquities* which appears on p. 385 *b* of the *Classical Review* for October, the reviewer (doubtless by an accidental oversight) describes *Suidas* as an error of the press. As the part of the Dictionary in which the alleged misprint is to be found was prepared for the press by myself, I may be permitted to say that I deliberately marked the quantity of the first two syllables in the way in which they are printed. The first two vowels cannot accurately be regarded as a diphthong; the first is certainly long, and the second is probably short. Labbe in his *Catholici Indices* marks the second syllable as short, 'though commonly pronounced long, *at quo privilegio nescio*.' It is true that the ordinary English pronunciation of the name follows the precedent set by Pope, who makes Suidas say in the *Dunciad*, iv 228,

For Attic Phrase in Plato let them seek,  
I poach in Suidas for unlicens'd Greek;

but Bentley himself was doubtless aware that the Lexicographer's name was a word of three syllables, Σουιδας, and that the disyllabic pronunciation was a popular error.

J. E. SANDYS.

SUUM CUIQUE.—It has been pointed out to me that the derivation of *non* which I suggested in the October number of the *Classical Review* has been already published by Mr. Wharton in the *Transactions of the Philological Society* for 1888 (sec. 13), and again in his *Etyyma Latina*, p. 66. I much regret that I had failed to observe this, and hereby tender my apologies to Mr. Wharton.

I take this opportunity of giving a list of the recorded forms of the I.-E. negative *ne*. They are as follows:—

I.-E.	Greek.	Italic.
1. <i>ñ, qu</i>	ἄ, ἄν	<i>in-</i>
2. <i>ñ</i>	?	<i>an-</i> (Osc. Umbr.)
3. <i>nñ</i>	—	<i>nñ(ei)</i>
4. <i>nē</i>	<i>ne- ?</i>	<i>ne (nec)</i>
5. <i>nō</i>	<i>νή</i>	<i>nē</i>
6. <i>nñi</i>	—	<i>nñ</i> (Osc. <i>nēi</i> )
7. <i>nō ?</i>	—	—
8. <i>nō</i>	—	<i>no(soc)</i> (Umbr.)
9. <i>nñi</i>	—	<i>noi(u), noc(num)</i>
10. <i>nñ ?</i>	—	—
11. <i>nā*</i>	<i>nā-</i>	<i>nām</i> (cf. οὐκοῦν) ?
12. <i>nā*</i>	<i>nai</i>	<i>nac</i>

*Nām*, however, may be an accusative or locative from a demonstrative *no-*. That Gk. *nā-* represents an I.-E. *ñ*, either in the case of the negative or elsewhere, seems to me to be an unproved hypothesis.

F. W. THOMAS.

\* \*

THE same correction (μεγάλας for μεγάλους) which in the last number of the *Classical Review* I proposed for Plut. *Them.* xxi. must be made also in Herod. viii. 111. I overlooked this for the moment.

H. RICHARDS.

\* \*

NOTES and Emendations on Herodas have appeared in the *Athenaeum* for Sept. 5 and Sept. 12 by W. Headlam; in the *Academy* Sept. 19 by T. Tyler; Sept. 26 by E. W. B. Nicholson, F. W. Hall and A. P.; Oct. 3 by E. W. B. Nicholson; Oct. 10 by E. W. B. Nicholson, H. Richards, W. Headlam, A. E. Crawley; Oct. 17 by F. B. Jevons and W. R. Hardie.

## ARCHAEOLOGY.

### MONTHLY RECORD.

#### GREAT BRITAIN.

*Stilechester*.—Excavations have now been steadily carried on for four months, on the system of working out the site by the squares into which it was divided by the Romans. So far they have been confined to the two squares, or *insulae*, immediately to the west of the great basilica, and to the completion of the large *insula* north of the forum which was begun last year.

The northern of the two new *insulae* has yielded

very interesting results. The centre of it seems to have been chiefly open ground or gardens, with buildings ranged round the four street sides. These include the more or less perfect remains of a number of shops and houses, the latter having rooms warmed by channelled hypocausts and floored with mosaic pavements. One very perfect set of shops has been uncovered, attached to a small but complete house, with a winter room warmed by a curious composite hypocaust, and a principal room with mosaic floor

of unusual pattern. The rubbish pits scattered over the *insula* have yielded many interesting and curious objects, chief among which are fictile vessels, many more or less perfect, representing all the principal kinds of Romano-British pottery, as well as the imported pseudo-Arretine. Of minor articles in bronze, bone and glass, many interesting examples have come to light, including a beautiful little enamelled stand; also numerous coins, mostly in indifferent preservation. The pits have yielded great quantities of animal bones, among which is the almost complete skeleton of a dog. Among architectural fragments may be noticed the base of a column of good design and workmanship. A small but perfect mosaic pavement in one of the houses has been taken up for preservation.

The southern *insula* has yielded many interesting remains from its rubbish pits, including pots and vessels of all kinds, fruit-stones and fish-bones, a set of bronze bucket-handles, a bronze bowl or saucepan, fibulae, pins, and other objects. From the trenches have been unearthened part of an inscription on a Purbeck marble slab, coins, and various architectural fragments. This *insula* covered a good deal of open ground; and among other buildings is the complete ground-plan of a house, a large series of chambers of uncertain use, a remarkable pavement of hard white *opus signinum*, and remains of other houses and hypocausts. The tessellated pavements are all badly preserved. Close to the house above-mentioned is a well lined with wood.

In the *insula* north of the forum a small shrine or altar has been uncovered, and a series of chambers along the main street; of remains, a perfect bronze figure of a goat, of good workmanship, and a fragment of some rare foreign marble, used probably as a wall-lining.<sup>1</sup>

*Whiteshill*, near Stroud. In the grounds of the vicarage have been found fragments of Roman pottery, calcined bones, and other remains. Like the Woodchester pavement, the first finds were but two feet below the surface, where a stratum of soft brick and cement mixed with charcoal was reached, the two former substances, laid to a regular thickness of about six inches, always constituting the *suspensurae*, or floors above the hypocaust, in Roman villas. Various coins were found, in excellent preservation, mostly of Constantine and Severus, one with the traditional wolf on the reverse.<sup>2</sup>

#### SWITZERLAND.

*Great St. Bernard*. Excavations on the site of the temple of Jupiter have brought to light a statue of Jupiter, 0.40 in. in height, of admirable workmanship, and in good preservation. A bronze lion (height 0.10 m.) and a number of medals were also recently found here.<sup>3</sup>

#### ITALY.

*Verona*. An interesting series of sculptures has been discovered here, together with other remains of little importance.

(1) A large draped female statue of Luna marble, wanting head and one foot, 2.05 metres in height. It is not unlike the Hera of Ephesos in the Vienna Academy (Overbeck, *Kunstm.* Atlas x. 30—32), which again is probably a copy of the Hera of Alkamenes; but more probably represents a Roman matron of the first century of our era.

(2) Another draped female figure, wanting head and left hand, of Greek marble, 1.65 m. in height,

including the plinth; it represents a Roman matron of the second century of the Empire.

(3) A draped female figure reclining on a couch, with feet crossed,—the right hand closed and resting on the breast; the head, left arm and shoulder, and part of the left breast are lost. The statue is of Pentelic marble, life size, and resembles the so-called Agrippina: it is of the second century of the Empire. The original is perhaps to be seen in a statue of the Museo Torlonia, and the type was created in the fourth century B.C. in a statue of Olympias, mother of Alexander the Great. Compare also a statuette in the Syracuse Museum (No. 6506).

(4) Trunk of a tree, nearly cylindrical, of Pentelic marble, 0.68 m. in height, attached to a plinth 0.66 m. thick, of which only a small part remains. On the top is part of a chlamys(?), and in the middle of the trunk a circular knot, on which is inscribed in small clear letters, apparently of the third or fourth century B.C.:

#### ΠΡΑΞΙΤΕΛΗΣ ΕΠΟΕΙ

If this can be attributed to either of the sculptors of this name, it must be the younger one (c. 300—280 A.D., Overbeck, *S. Q.* § 2073).

(5) A marble male head of careful workmanship, with short curly hair, short beard (such as Nero or Hadrian wears), and slight moustaches. Height 0.285 m. It is suggested that this is a copy of the head of some well known personage of the first century of the Empire, possibly the young Augustus; but the beard makes this improbable, unless it were a mourning type. Fragments of twelve other statues were also discovered. All these remains are from a public edifice of the best Roman period.<sup>4</sup>

*Vado*, near Genoa. On the site of the ancient Vada Sabatia various objects have been found in a wall of Roman construction, formed of large slabs.

(1) Fictile remains: fragments of amphorae and other vases, and of a lamp stamped OPTATI in relief, also a lamp with representation of a horse running. (2) Bronze objects: a right hand, with thumb and two fingers extended, 0.145 m. in height, inscribed

ΑΡΙΣΤΟΚΛΗΣ[Ε]ΠΙΣΤΑΤΕΥΣΑ[Ε]  
ΔΙCΑΒΑΖΙΩ[Ι], in late lettering; Sabazius must have been the eponymous deity of the place.

A similar right hand, ht. 0.10 m.; in the palm a support with a hole bored in the middle, probably for a seated statuette also found here (a male bearded deity with pileus, long tunic, and shoes, holding a pine cone in right hand, left hand resting on hip, height 0.08 m.). On the wrist is part of a bracelet, with a medallion on which is the figure of a female reclining, holding an infant to her breast; on her left is a bird. This was probably an *ex voto* of a woman after childbirth. Compare three votive bronze hands in the British Museum. A statuette of Mercury with winged petasus, purse, and other attributes. A cow walking, with tail curved over the back; height 0.07, length 0.09 m. Other bronze objects, all of good technique and style, well preserved, and with a fine patina. The style is not much later than the time of the Antonines, probably about A.D. 200. Coins of Augustus, Claudius, Severus Alexander, and Probus, were also found.<sup>5</sup>

*Bologna*. Some fine mosaic pavements have been discovered here. There are no traces of dividing

<sup>1</sup> *Times*, 3 October, 1891.

<sup>2</sup> *Guardian*, 30 September.

<sup>3</sup> *Athenaeum*, 26 September.

<sup>4</sup> *Notizie dei Lincei*, January 1891.

<sup>5</sup> *Notizie dei Lincei*, February 1891.

walls, but a furrow 0·60 m. wide paved with large flat slabs on which is black beaten earth. This evidently formed the foundation for a wooden partition between the two chambers, which was covered with plaster.<sup>1</sup>

*Spoleto, Umbria.* There exists in the Uffizi gallery at Florence a plan of a theatre purporting to be that of Spoleto, but it was never mentioned in inscriptions of the place or any other record, and consequently its existence was doubted. Excavations have, however, proved its actual existence, and the measurements agree with the plan in the Uffizi, so that it has been possible to reconstruct the whole theatre.<sup>2</sup>

*S. Maria di Falleri, Tuscany.* Three tombs have been found here dating about 200 B.C., in which were numerous vases, some with paintings, of Etruscan fabric, one being inscribed in Latin and Faliscan. The tombs are of rectangular form, with a large pilaster in the middle supporting the roof, and *loculi* for the cinerary urns closed with tiles, on which inscriptions are painted in red. Among the vases are two large ones of cylindrical shape with two handles and mouth widening at the top, also an oinochoe and a kantharos. Four of the tiles bear Etruscan inscriptions, others are inscribed in Latin, with the names of C. and M. Spurilius.<sup>2</sup>

*Sutri, in Latium.* In restoring the cathedral, fluted columns of Luna marble, of the Corinthian order, and dating from the first century of the Empire, were discovered. They had originally sustained the arches dividing the three naves of the cathedral (eight a side, 3·60 m. in height, the distance between them 2·90 m.), and are marked on a plan found in 1743, but have since been pulled down, or covered up with new work. They evidently belonged to a Roman temple or basilica, which in the time of Constantine or Theodosius was converted into a Christian church.

In renewing the pavement, a block of marble was found with a relief representing a draped bearded figure reading a papyrus held in both hands, and standing in an attitude of worship before a terminal statue; it is of very late date, probably the fifth century.<sup>1</sup>

*Citta Ducale, in Abruzzo.* Remains of the ancient city of Aquae Cutiliae, in the Sabine territory, have been discovered here, consisting of stone walls of *opus reticulatum* lined with marble slabs, of the time of Hadrian. These enclosed a hall 7·50 × 7·80 m., with an entrance on the west side, and pilasters along the sides both within and without. This hall was apparently part of the *thermae*, of which other chambers have also been discovered, with masonry of *opus incertum*, and pipes of clay for hot and cold water. On the south side were found a corridor and nymphaeum, also four fountains of *opus incertum* cased with *opus signinum*, of semicircular shape, and adorned with conch-shells. At the angles are slender pilasters with ornaments of blue glass paste. The pavements were formed of squares of white and palombino marble. A staircase leading to the *caldarium* was brought to light, also the *laconicum*, in which was a basin 3·95 m. in diameter; the walls were plastered in white and red. Bronze coins of Augustus and later Emperors were found, also a votive altar dedicated by T. Flavius Iulianus Libertus to the twelve Gods, 0·75 × 0·47 × 0·42 m.<sup>1</sup>

*Stilo, in Calabria.* Dr. Orsi reports on discoveries made in constructing the new lighthouse on Cape Stilo. Besides remains of a Greek wall of large

blocks of Syracusan limestone, many archaic terracottas were found, including the torso of a female figure wearing a *calathus*, probably an Aphrodite like those found at Locri. A small Herma was likewise found, wearing a *calathus*, and several small altars either for the sacred fire or for supporting anathemata, their faces decorated with archaic reliefs of animals in combat. Remains of a small temple were discovered, dedicated to some sailors' deity, Poseidon, Taras, or the Delphic Apollo; also fragments of painted terracotta, evidently architectural, one representing Taras riding on a dolphin. The site appears to be within the boundaries of the ancient city of Caulonia; here were also found ruins of a Graeco-Roman villa and a barbarian cemetery.<sup>2</sup>

## GREECE.

*Argos.* In the course of excavations under the amphitheatre M. Kouphiniotis has discovered twenty-one rows of seats at a considerable depth, and the foundations of the stage and orchestra, also numerous fragments of marble, and a stylobate, which gives hope that the remains of the buildings may be discovered. The orchestra was partly hewn out of the rock, partly covered with slabs of stone; behind it were five walls, one behind the other at short intervals. The first three are of the Roman period, the two latter belong to the *skene*-buildings of the Greek period. Among other discoveries are an aqueduct, two columns of tufa, a Roman inscription, and some coins.<sup>3</sup>

*Mycenae.* The beehive tomb or 'Kuppelgrab' of Abia has been more fully excavated (*Ep. Arch.* 1891, p. 189 *seq.*). The top has fallen in, but the doorway, and the lower courses of masonry to the height of 3·25 metres remain, also the *propylaeum*, which is 12·85 m. long and 2·18 m. broad. The side-walls are formed of small stones built up with mortar. The *tholos* is built of hewn stone, with small pebbles filling up the interstices, and the sill of the door is formed of three large slabs. The tomb was rifled in ancient times, and nothing has been found in it except a few fragments of gold-leaf, and two leaden figures, male and female. The male is the better preserved, is 0·12 m. high, and has a garment covering the loins, like the figures on the Vaphio drinking-cups. The female is 0·85 m. in height, and wears a close fitting garment hanging straight down, concealing the feet.<sup>4</sup>

*Samothece.* On the site where the famous Niké now in the Louvre was discovered, a small fragment of an inscription has come to light, which is important from seeming to have borne the name of a sculptor of Rhodes who may perhaps have been the author of that masterpiece. Unfortunately only the name of his country has been preserved, the artist's own name being almost entirely obliterated.<sup>5</sup>

*Athenaeum*, 19 September. Mr. Neilson proposes a suggestion with regard to the wall of Antoninus Pius. At intervals along the line of the wall are segmental projections, which he considers may have been used for supporting *ballistae*, especially as many stone projectiles have been found in the vicinity. Ammianus Marcellinus (xiii. 4) describes a machine known as the *onager* (Smith, *Dict. Ant.* II. p. 856), which threw round stones (*lapide rotundo fundae imposito*), and was not set on the wall itself as it would not stand the shock of the discharge, but on supports of sod or brick (*super congestos caespites vel latericios aggeres*). Hyginus urges the importance of erecting stands for artillery (*tormentis tribunalia*

<sup>1</sup> *Notizie dei Lincei*, January 1891.

<sup>2</sup> *Notizie dei Lincei*, February 1891.

<sup>3</sup> *Athenaeum*, 10 October.

<sup>4</sup> *Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift*, 19 Sept.

<sup>5</sup> *Athenaeum*, 26 September.



extruere, so called because the tribunal in the Roman camp was originally formed of sods). The same thing may be seen in the wall of Hadrian (Bruce's *Handbook*, pp. 142, 145).

THE THEATRE AT MEGALOPOLIS.—In the miscellaneous notes at the end of the current number of the *Athenische Mittheilungen* Dr. Dörpfeld reviews the controversy provoked by the statements of certain members of the British School at Athens about the results of their excavations in the theatre at Megalopolis.<sup>1</sup> His arguments are briefly these:—

The wall at the back with the three doors stands on foundations of older date, which clearly belong to the original structure; so this wall was added during some reconstruction of the theatre: and the doors are apparently of still later date—at all events in their present form. The wall and doors may therefore be neglected in investigating the original design.

As for the flight of five steps leading up to the alleged stage, the two upper steps extend round the sides while the three lower steps are confined to the front, and the two upper steps differ materially from the three lower steps in size and form. Thus, the three lower steps must have been added at a time when the orchestra was lowered. If the orchestra really was lowered, the seats of honour in the front row cannot be in their original position; and, as a matter of fact, they have been moved. The two upper steps must have belonged to a colonnade of the fourth century; for all around there are remains of columns, capitals, architrave and triglyphs of that date, and these just match the steps in size and workmanship, the columns moreover having dowel-holes that exactly fit the dowel-holes on the upper step.

The players must have acted in front of this colonnade, not on top of it; and must likewise have acted in front of the structure marked Q in the plan *J. H. S.* xi. 295, after that was built. This structure, however, was only 11 ft. 6 in. in height: and here Dr. Dörpfeld's reasoning seems somewhat hazy.

C. T.

*Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique.* March—June, 1891. Athens and Paris.

1. Clerc gives a further account of his rather fruitless excavations in 1882 on the site of Aegae near Smyrna: seven woodcuts. 2. Fougères states the results of his excavations among the ruins of the Gymnasium at Delos—plan of the building—and publishes a dozen inscriptions that he found there, incidentally reviewing all inscriptions that relate to the organization of the Epheboi at Delos. 3. Homolle publishes a Delian inscription lately found on a little island near Amorgos: it contains part of the statement of revenue and expenditure for some year shortly before 250 B.C. 4. Babelon discusses the coinage attributed to Sidon under Persian dominion, and finds new dates for certain kings of Sidon and other rulers: two plates. 5. Fougères publishes a sketch made by Conze in 1860 from a relief then at Tegea, but now lost, representing a bull in combat: woodcut. 6. Jamot and Deschamps publish two-and-twenty inscriptions from the south of Thessaly. 7. Homolle publishes nine inscriptions lately found at Athens in the new railway-cutting for the extension of the Peiræus line towards the palace: plan. These fix the site of 'the precinct of the Demos and the Charites,' indicate that the archonship of Heliodoros was probably in 217/6 B.C., and

include the only known signature of the sculptor Bryaxis. 8. Radet endeavours to fix the sites of Callatebos and Cydrara in Asia Minor. 9. Jamot describes a bronze arm, above life-size, which he found in his excavations in the sanctuary of the Muses on Helicon together with other fragments of bronze, and points out that this arm and some of the fragments would suit the group of Apollo and Hermes by Lysippos: plate and six woodcuts. 10. Legrand and Doublet publish five-and-twenty inscriptions from Euboea. 11. Couve publishes another inscription from Oreos in Euboea. 12. Lambros describes a tetradrachm of the class now attributed to Allaria instead of Sparta, remarking that it bears the name of the tyrant Nabis: woodcut. 13. Cousin publishes twenty-one inscriptions from the neighbourhood of Stratoniceia in Asia Minor. C. T.

*Revue Archéologique.* March—April, 1891. Paris.

1. Waile and Gauckler publish about a hundred Latin inscriptions, fragmentary and unimportant, most of them from Caesarea-Iol, now Cherchel in Algeria. 3. Vercoûtre suggests that the words *Malagbel* and *Eruc* in Latin inscriptions from N. Africa do not denote local deities of those names, but Baal of Malaca (now Guelma in Algeria) and the Sicilian hero Eryx. 8. Mowat publishes a military diploma of 9 October 148 A.D. from Antoninus Pius to Atta, son of Nivio, on his discharge from the cohort I. Ulpia Pannoniorum: two plates. It was found at Aszár near Komorn in Hungary. 9. Engel briefly notes the contents of various antiquarian collections in Spain and Portugal. 14. Cagnat reprints the principal inscriptions referring to Roman affairs published during the first quarter of the present year; forty Latin and five Greek. C. T.

*The same.* May—June, 1891.

1. Deloche describes four more signet-rings of the Merovingian period, including the ring of Childeric, the father of Clovis. 2. Th. Reinach describes three terra-cotta groups lately found in the Troad, and now in the Museum at Constantinople: three plates and two woodcuts. They represent (a) Aphrodite and Eros, (b) Aphrodite with Eros and Poitho or Adonis, (c) two girls dancing. He assigns them all to the third century B.C., and supposes that they were made in the Troad itself. 4. Lechat discusses the style of certain archaic statues on the Acropolis at Athens, insisting particularly upon the influence of wood-carving in the earliest sculpture in soft stone: three plates. 7. Waile describes a bronze lately found at Berroughia in Algeria: woodcut. He discusses the personification of Africa, and the elephant as its symbol; this bronze representing a female bust wearing an elephant's hide. 8. Bonsor and Engel report some small discoveries in the Roman necropolis of Carmona near Seville. 13. Cagnat reprints the principal inscriptions referring to Roman affairs published during the second quarter of the present year; sixty-two Latin and five Greek. C. T.

*Gazette des Beaux-Arts.* June, 1891. Paris.

2. Marcel Reymond describes a marble statue of a boy—probably a son of Niobe—found a few years ago on the site of Nero's villa near Subiaco: four views of the statue from photographs. C. T.

*The same.* September, 1891.

3. Maxime Collignon discusses the style of Argive and other Argive sculptors, recognizing this in various works now extant: seven illustrations. C. T.

<sup>1</sup> See *ante* pp. 238, 284, 343.

*The same.* October, 1891.

1. Salomon Reinach describes a figure of Dionysos in terra-cotta, and another in bronze—both belonging to private collections—and suggests that they are copies of the Dionysos of Praxiteles: three views of each. C. T.

*Archäologisches Jahrbuch.* 1891. Part 1. Berlin.

1. Bie argues somewhat vaguely that the Greeks gradually evolved the design of the dwelling, as described by Vitruvius, from the design of the palace, as exemplified at Tiryns. 2. Sauer rearranges the sculpture in the eastern pediment of the temple of Zeus at Olympia, mainly on technical grounds: twenty-five woodcuts. He confirms Six's opinion that the two groups of horses were being harnessed to two four-horsed chariots, three already in and the fourth coming up, *Hellenic Journal*, vol. x., plate VI., but brings the fourth horse nearer up and in front of the chariot instead of behind. He also confirms Brunn's opinion (adopted by Six) that in the central group the two women stood next to Zeus and the two men beyond. In various subordinate points he corrects all the arrangements hitherto proposed. 3. Graef publishes some fragments of a vase from the Acropolis: plate and woodcut. The vase was unquestionably painted by Hieron, and represented a procession of deities on one side, and a sacrifice on the other. It supplies early authority (probably before 480 B.C.) for the story in Apollodoros, iii. 4, 3, that the infant Dionysos was reared as a girl. 4. Fränkel emends the Delphi inscription, *B. C. H.* v. 388, transforming the envoys from Pergamon into painters sent from Pergamon about 140 B.C. by Attalos II. to make copies of the frescoes in the Lesche, and then discusses the cultivation of literature and art at Pergamon generally.

*Anzeiger.* Treu: removal of the Dresden collection of casts from the Zwinger to the new galleries in the former Zeughaus, and installation there. Loeschke: recent additions to the University collection of antiquities at Bonn. Treu and Schreiber: antiquities in private collections at Dresden and Leipzig. C. T.

*The same.* 1891. Part 2.

1. Wolters interprets a terra-cotta group from Tanagra as Tyro with her children: plate. 2. Treu replies to Sauer's article on the eastern pediment of the temple of Zeus at Olympia, contradicting him generally, and rejecting his arrangement of the central group on the ground that the two men would be too tall for the pediment in their new places, and his arrangement of the chariot groups on the ground that the four horses must be abreast to come

within the length really available: a dozen woodcuts.

3. Furtwängler endorses Treu's condemnation of Sauer, but transposes two figures in Treu's own arrangement: woodcut. 4. Sauer advocates new opinions about certain figures in the western pediment: five woodcuts. 5. Treu contradicts Furtwängler and Sauer with regard to the eastern and western pediments respectively. Short reply from Furtwängler. Full reply from Sauer to follow. 6. Furtwängler recognizes the Cyclopes in the masks upon the handles of Greek braziers, incidentally pointing out the close connection between the Satyrs and the Cyclopes, and discussing the group of vases with paintings of these creatures striking at the head of Ge with hammers.

*Anzeiger.* Catalogue of about 850 photographs of Greek buildings and antiquities from negatives belonging to the Institut: copies are offered for sale, as similar views are not procurable at shops.

C. T.

*Athenische Mittheilungen.* 1891. Part 2. Athens.

1. Wolters discusses the statue of Athene Hygieia by Pyrrhos on the Acropolis at Athens: plate and two woodcuts. The extant pedestal of this statue was not built on to the Propylaea until the completion of that structure had been abandoned: so this is not the statue that Pericles dedicated to Athene Hygieia. It probably was dedicated in 429 B.C. after the plague. The story in Plutarch, Pericles, 13, is not to be connected with the story in Pliny, xxii. 43, xxxiv. 81. 2. Thurnb publishes twenty unimportant inscriptions from Thera, and twenty-eight from Amorgos. 3. Sauer attacks Petersen's theory that the pedestal at Delos with the signature of Archermos carried a statue at Nike, and argues that it carried a statue of some animal: eight woodcuts. 4. Conze describes a votive relief in the British Museum representing Hermes-Kadmos and other deities: woodcut. 5. Weber describes his visit to Colossae, and suggests that Herodotos got the story about the subterranean course of the Lycos, vii. 30, by confusing the long valley and some little natural bridges: plan. 6. Brückner, in a discursive article, locates Pallene on a hill near the village of Koropi midway between Athens and Laurion, and interprets a painting of Pallas (the son of Pandion) with other heroes on a red-figured crater found on the Acropolis in the deposits made after the Persian invasion: plate with view of the landscape, map and sketch, and two woodcuts of the vase. 7. Th. Mommsen publishes a Latin inscription from Apamea Cibotos containing part of the decree for adjusting the Asiatic year to the Julian year. C. T.

## SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS.

*American Journal of Philology.* No. 44. December 1890. (See *Classical Review* *supr.* p. 133.)

*On the articular infinitive in Polybius.* Part ii. E. G. W. Hewlett. This paper deals with the dative of the Art. Inf., prepositions and quasi-prepositions with the gen. and dat. respectively, and prepositions with the accus. 'As in classical prose the majority of datives of the Art. Inf. are causal in sense and the instrumental use is not common.' *χαρὶν* with gen. of Art. Inf. is particularly common in Polyb. occurring 176 times. Prof. Gildersleeve has a note on the article with proper names, showing that the

use is essentially a prose use, belonging to the sphere of familiar language, and so is common in Aristophanes and Plato. He refers particularly to the dissertation of C. Schmidt, *de articulo in nominibus propriis apud Atticos scriptores pedestres* (Kiel 1890). Among the books received are T. Benfey's *Kleinere Schriften* by H. Collitz, and Jebb's critical apparatus to the *Antigone* by M. W. Humphreys. Bury's *Nemean Odes* of Pindar is briefly mentioned.

No 45. April 1891.

*On adaptation of suffixes in congeneric classes of substantives*, by M. Bloomfield. That is, 'the infusion

with some definite grammatical or lexical value, of a formal element originally either devoid of any special functional value, or possessed of a value which has faded out so completely as to make this infusion possible.' 1, The Greek nomin. *ποῦς*, which is considered to be in imitation of Pan-Hellenic *δοῦς*, both being parts of the body. 2, designations of parts of the body by heteroclitic stems in *r* and *n*. 3, designation of parts of the body by other heteroclitic declensions with *n*-stems in the oblique cases. 4, designations of parts of the body in Armenian. 5, the I.E. word for 'member, limb.' 6, Gothic *fōtus* and *tunþus*. 7, excursus on words for right and left. 8, assimilation of opposites, and assimilation of congeners. 9, designations of birds, animals, and plants in Greek. 10, designations of divisions of time. 11, adaptation in other substantial categories. Lexical adaptation is not restricted to substantial categories, e.g. we have *μηκέρι* in the analogy of *οὐκέρι*, *ἡττάσθαι* a modification of *\*ἡττοῦσθαι* after the pattern of *νικάσθαι*, *versutus* a modification of *versatus* on the analogy of *astutus*. On *paroxytone accent in tribrach and dactylic endings*, F. G. Allinson. In opposition to Rule iv. in Wheeler's dissertation 'Der Nominal-accent' (Strassburg 1885), 'that words with dactylic ending, which were originally oxytone, change into paroxytones as a compromise between the original (I.E.) oxytonesis and the special Greek-accent,' it is maintained that the true facts are, 1. trochaic oxytones either remain oxytone or become paroxytone; 2. in general, tribrachs and dactyls fare alike even in anastrophe; 3. in *active* compounds, pyrrhics (whether dactylic or tribrach) are paroxytone because the tendency to 'recession' was arrested midway by the desire to accent the last member. F. B. Tarbell has a note on the infin. after expressions of fearing in Greek, quoting the foll. exx. of pres. or aor. infin. in indirect discourse: Aesch. *Sept.* 417-21, 720 foll., Soph. *Aj.* 254-5, Eur. *Ion* 1564-5, *Med.* 1256-7, comp. Goodwin *M. and T.* §§ 372, 373. Prof. Gildersleeve shows that the rule as to the identity of tenses in the use of *λαθῶνα*, *τυγχάνω* and *φθάνω* is not nearly so regular with *τυγχάνω* as with the other two, comp. Goodwin *M. and T.* §§ 144, 146. Among the books reviewed are Sonnenschein's edition of the *Rudens* by E. P. Morris, 'a good edition of a good play' and Kenyon's *Aristotle on the Constitution of Athens* by Prof. Gildersleeve who is grateful to the editor. 'If Mr. Kenyon has made worse mistakes in Greek than some of his critics, I have failed to notice them.'

#### Litterarisches Centralblatt. 1890.

No. 26. Heisterbergk, *Fragen der ältesten Geschichte Siziliens*. 'A series of subtle combinations reaching a probable conclusion. Commendable mastery of material and clearness of proof.'—Epping, *Astronomisches aus Babylon*. 'Epoch-making. Pleasantly written.'—Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, *Euripides Herakles*. 'An extraordinary advance over all predecessors.'—*Grammatici Graeci* I. ed. Hilgard. 'To be commended.'

No. 27. *Itinerarium Antonini* herausgegeben und übersetzt von Gildemeister. 'A careful revision of the text.'—*Scala, die Studien des Polybios*. 'An interesting subject discussed with spirit. Not all the inferences are justified.'

No. 28. Neumann, *der römische Staat und die allgemeine Kirche*. 'A delightful book, presenting a faithful picture of church history.'—Bartholomae *Indogermanisch s.c.* 'Essentially a polemic against J. Schmidt.'—Larsen, *Studia critica in Plutarchi Moralia*. 'The method is good.'—Droysen, *das Heerwesen der Griechen*. 'The material is neatly worked into

shape.'—Schiess, *Collegia funeraticia*. 'An intelligent little book, but not exhaustive.'

No. 29. Mommsen, *Römisches Staatsrecht*. 'The relation of Mommsen to the sources is uncertain. He grows more and more sceptical, and believes almost nothing of the accounts of early times, and yet he uses many of these invented stories for his *Staatsrecht*.'—Zimmermann, *Untersuchungen zu Quintus Smyrnaeus*. 'Too prolix. Contains all sorts of *krims-krams*.'—Roscher, *Lexikon der Mythologie* I. 'Roscher should call the attention of some of his associates to the fact that this lexicon is not a numismatic or epigraphic journal.'

No. 30. *Tertulliani Opera*, ed. Reifferscheidt et Wissowa. 'Excellent.'—Hartman, *Analecta Xenophontea*. 'Contains much that is good and much that is worthless.'—*Ausonius' Mosella*, par M de la Vello de Mirimont. 'The chief value of the work consists in the careful description of the numerous editions.'

No. 31. Breusing, *die Lösung des Triereratsels*. 'The explanations are based upon nautical experience and generally command assent. The polemical tone against Assman is unpleasant.'

No. 32. Guldenpenning, *die Kirchengeschichte des Theodoret von Kyrrhos*. 'An endeavour to discover Theodoret's sources. The author discusses T.'s relation to the contemporary orthodox continuations of the history of Eusebius, and shows that Theodoret made use of the works of Socrates and Sozomenus.'—Graf, *Romanische Alterthümer des bayerischen Nationalmuseums*. 'The work seems to be trustworthy and complete. The 12 plates are clear and good.'

No. 33. Diehl, *Etudes sur l'administration Byzantine*; Hartmann, *Untersuchungen zur Byzantinischen Verwaltung*. 'Diehl's book is on a broader plan and far more complicated than Hartmann's clear work.'—Bergmans, *Autobiographie de Juste Lipsce*. A complimentary notice.—Studniczka, *Kyrene*. 'Convincing on every point.'

No. 35. Fröhlich, *Das Kriegswesen Caesars*. A valuable work, partly supplementing and partly correcting Rustow's book.—*Homeri Odyssea* rec. Ludwich. I. The text has been formed according to the principles laid down in his *Aristarch*. The tradition of the grammarians has never been so clearly set forth or influenced the text so much as in the present edition.—Cagnat, *L'Année épigraphique*. A careful bibliography (with short abstracts of the more important works) of the publications having to do with Latin epigraphy published in 1889. The arrangement according to months should be changed for one according to subjects.

No. 36. Schulte *de restitutione atque indole genuinae versionis Graecae in libro Iudicum*. Schulte's work shows a lack of sound philological training.—Schmid, *Der Atticismus in seinen Hauptvertretern*. II. Deals with the style of Aelius Aristides. Details are open to criticism, but the whole is very satisfactory. More stress ought to have been laid upon Aristides' indebtedness to Demosthenes.

No. 37. Simson, *Der Begriff der Seele bei Plato*. Gives as introduction a historical sketch of the pre-platonic Psychology. In his treatment of Plato's doctrine, his results are mainly the same as Zeller's.—*Ignatii diaconi vita Tarasii . . . graece primum edid. Heikel*. A good edition. Full and careful index Graecitatis.—Hoffmann, *Ueber einige phöniki-sche Inschriften*. Of interest for the classical philologist are H.'s etymologies of the proper names Dido, Semiramis, Monica; the explanation of a passage in the *Penulus* and of some bilingual inscriptions.—Regnaud, *Les grandes lignes du vocalisme*, &c. Worthless.—

Danielsson, *Epigraphica*. Discusses two Greek inscriptions: (1) Cauer<sup>2</sup> 121, col. 13f., 'τῶν ἀγγελῶν τοὺς τόκα ἐγδυμένους.' Beginning of col. C. 'μήτε γυναῖκα τίκεν κατὰ φύσιν, ἀλλὰ] θ[αύ]μα[τα] comparing Aesch. c. Ctes. 111. (2) *Bull. de corr. hell.* xiii. p. 281 f. D. supplies §§ 8, 9, 10 satisfactorily. ὄφλιν ἰν δάμων he takes with Meister = ὄφλιν εἰς δῆμον. From § 5 he concludes that the date of the inscription is after 395.—Kammer, *Ein ästhetischer Commentar zu Homer's Ilias*. K. adopts the interpolation theory. Books 3, 10, 13, 14, and the greater part of 4, 5, 7, 8, 12, 15, 17, 20 were not in the original. His characterization of the heroes of the *Iliad* is excellent. The commentary shows a deep appreciation of and insight into the poetical beauties of the poem.—Torp, *Die griech. Nominalflexion*. A concise comparative sketch of the Indo-European Noun-inflection, especially valuable until Brugmann's *Grundriss* is finished.—Wernicke, *Die griechischen Vasen mit Lieblingsnamen*. A careful collection and discussion of the material. The καλός refers now to the self-praise of the artist in general, now to some figures represented (gods, heroes, even ἑταῖραι). W.'s interpretation of the names is occasionally very bold.

No. 38. Μηλιαράκης, *Νεοελληνική γεωγραφική φιλολογία ἢτοι κατάλογος τῶν ἀπὸ τοῦ 1800—1890, γεωγραφθέντων ὑπὸ Ἑλλήνων*. Valuable on account of his references to Greek periodicals. The titles often lack the necessary exactness.—Smyth, the vowel system of the Ionic dialect. An introduction to an Ionic grammar. The author shows great familiarity with the results of modern research, and the book contains not a few valuable suggestions of his own. His work on the Greek dialects to be published by the Clarendon Press must be looked for with interest.—Hagen, *Ueber Wesen und Bedeutung der Homerfrage*. A lecture delivered in 1879, giving a concise outline of the history of the Homeric question.—Klette, *Beiträge zur Geschichte und Literatur der ital. Gelehrtenrenaissance*. III. *Die griechischen Briefe des Franciscus Philolophus*. Contains a great amount of valuable information on Ph.

and the other Hellenists of his time. (There follow nearly two columns of conjectures by the reviewer, H. H.)—Buresch, *Klaros*. Text of and commentary on the inscription on the base of a statue of Apollo found by B. in 1888 in the Turkish village of Tmolos. History of the oracle of Klaros; collection of and discussion of the oracles. In appendix B. publishes for the first time *χρησμοὶ τῶν Ἑλλήνων θεῶν*, which formed a part of a *θεοσοφία* (about 480). The style is good, B.'s knowledge of the later Greek literature thorough.—Schreiber *Die hellenistischen Reliefbilder*. 2—6 Lief. A work valuable and interesting both for the archaeologist and the artist. The five instalments contain a number of unpublished monuments.

39. Meister, *Zum eleischen arkadischen und kyprischen Dialekte*. Defence against O. Hoffmann's criticism of Meister's Vol. II. on Greek dialects.—Teuffel, *Studien und Charakteristiken zur griech. u. röm. Litteraturgeschichte*, 2nd. ed. The essays on Hölderlin and Schwegler have been omitted. The introduction to Cicero's oration pro Quintio is published for the first time. A short biography of J. is added.—*Plauti fabularum reliquiae Ambrosianae*... ed. Studemund. The fruit of nearly twenty-five years, showing immense perseverance, care, and ingenuity. Most points regarding the reading are settled now definitely.

*Leipziger Studien*, vol. xiii. (1890-91). The first part contains two essays, one by Paul Panske, on the financial officers of Athens in the fourth century B.C., the second by Armin Dittmar, on the Athenian custom of conferring crowns upon foreigners. The second part opens with a paper by Gotthold Ettig, entitled *Acheruntica*. This is a survey of the various classical myths respecting descents into the lower world. The volume is concluded by a short discussion from the hand of J. H. Lipsius, on the Athenian decree respecting Samos, passed between the battle of Aegospotami and the siege of Athens. The inscription was discovered in 1888 on the Acropolis.

H. N.

## LIST OF NEW BOOKS.

### FOREIGN BOOKS.

Abhandlungen, Breslauer philologische. Herausgegeben von R. Förster. Band VI. Heft 1 and 2. 8vo. Breslau, W. Koebner. 5 Mk.

[Contents: I. De Tacitei de oratoribus dialogi codicum nexu et fide scripsit F. Scheuer. viii, 49 pp. 2 Mk. II. De Q. Aurelii Symmachi studiis graecis et latinis scripsit G. Kroll. 99 pp. 3 Mk.] Adamek (O.) Beiträge zur Geschichte des Byzantinischen Kaisers Mauricius (582-602). II. 8vo. 32 pp. Graz. 1 Mk. 30.

Arbois de Jubainville (H. d'). Les noms gaulois chez César et Hirtius (de Bello Gallico) avec la collaboration de MM. Ernault et Doltin. Serie I. Les Composés dont rix est le dernier terme. 18mo. xvi, 25 pp. Paris, Bouillon.

Aristophanes. Pluto; Commedia. Volgarizzamento di L. Rasi, con lettera-prefazione e prologo in versi di A. Franchetti. 8vo. 74 pp. Modena, Sarasin.

Aristoteles. Ἀθηναίων Πολιτεία. (La costituzione degli Ateniesi.) Testo greco, versione italiana, introduzione e note per cura del Prof. C. Ferrini. 12mo. xxxvi, 139 pp. Milano, Hoepli. 3 l. 50.

— qui fertur liber Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία. De re-

publica Atheniensium. Post Kenyonem ediderunt H. van Herwerden et J. van Leeuwen. 8vo. xvi, 241 pp. Leiden, A. W. Sijthoff. 6 Mk.

Aristoteles. πολιτεία Ἀθηναίων ediderunt G. Kaibel et U. de Wilamowitz-Moellendorf. 12mo. xvi, 100 pp. Berlin, Weidmann. 1 Mk. 80.

— Les Problèmes traduits en français pour la première fois et accompagnés de notes perpétuelles par B. St. Hilaire. 2 vols. 8vo. Tome I. xci, 438 pp. Tome II. 520 pp. Paris, Hachette et Cie.

— La République Athénienne traduite en français par T. Reinach. 16mo. Paris, Hachette et Cie. 1 fr. 50.

— Schrift vom Staatswesen der Athener. Verdeutsch von G. Kaibel und A. Kiessling. 2<sup>te</sup> verbesserte Auflage. vi, 109 pp. Strassburg, K. J. Trübner. 2 Mk.

— Staat der Athener. Uebersetzt von F. Poland. 16mo. xii, 114 pp. Berlin, Langenscheidt. 70 pf. [See below under Bauer, Cassel, Dareste, Lipsius, Meyer, P.]

Arnold (T.) Die griechischen Studien des Horaz. Neu herausgegeben von W. Fries. 8vo. xiii,



- 143 pp. Halle. Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses. 2 Mk.
- Audouin* (E.) Étude sommaire des dialectes grecs littéraires (autres que l'attique): homérique, non-vel-ionien, dorien, éolien. Avec préface par O. Riemann. 16mo. viii, 320 pp. Paris, Klincksieck.
- Attenstaedt* (F.) De Hecataei Milesii fragmentis quae ad Hispaniam et Galliam pertinent. (I.) Diss. Leipzig 91. 91 S. 8vo.
- Babrius*, Fables. Texte grec avec introduction, Notes et un lexique par M. L. Feuillet. 12mo. 184 pp. Paris, Belin frères.
- Bahnisch* (F.) Die Zukunft des griechischen Sprachunterrichts auf den Gymnasien. 8vo. 23 pp. Konitz, C. F. Wollsdorf. 50 pf.
- Barillari* (M.) Studi su la satira romana. 16mo. xi, 145 pp. Messina, Tipografia dell' Epoca. 21. 50.
- Baron* (Ch.) Le pronom relatif et la conjonction en grec et principalement dans la langue homérique. 8vo. 199 pp. Paris, Picard. 5 fr.
- De Platonis dicendi genere. 8vo. 80 pp. Paris, Picard. 2 fr.
- Bartelsstein* (L.) Zur Beurteilung des Kaisers Julianus. Pr. Bayreuth 91. 53 S. 8vo.
- Bauer* (A.) Literarische und historische Forschungen zu Aristoteles' *Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία*. 8vo. vii, 190 pp. München, C. H. Beck. 3 Mk.
- Becher* (F.) Zum 10. Buch des Quintilian. Pr. Aurich 91. 28 S. 4to.
- Berger* (H.) Geschichte der wissenschaftlichen Erdkunde der Griechen. 3te Abtheilung: Die Geographie der Erdkugel. 8vo. xii, 158 pp. Leipzig, Veit & Co. 4 Mk. 40.
- Bibliotheca philologica classica. Verzeichniss der auf dem Gebiete der classischen Alterthumswissenschaft erschienenen Bücher etc. Beiblatt zum Jahresbericht über die Fortschritte der classischen Alterthumswissenschaft. Jahrgang xviii, 1891. 4 Hefte. 8vo. Heft I. 90 pp. Berlin, Calvary & Co. 6 Mk.
- Binde* (O.) Ein Blick in das römische Schulwesen. Grl. Steglitz 90. 9 S. 4to.
- Boemer* (A.) De correptione vocabulorum naturalium iambicorum Terentiana. Diss. Münster 91. 69 S. 8vo.
- Boeswillwald et Cagnat*. Timgad. Une cité africaine sous l'empire romain. Livraison 1. 4to. pp. I—xxii. Paris, Leroux. 5 fr.
- Cassel* (P.) Vom neuen Aristoteles und seiner Tendenz. Bemerkungen. 8vo. vii, 39 pp. Berlin, Bibliographisches Bureau. 80 pf.
- Cabull's* Gedichte in neuen Uebersetzungen von F. Freze. 8vo. 66 pp. Salzwedel, G. Klingenstein. 1 Mk.
- Cicero*. I libri delle leggi, tradotti e commentati da R. Pasculli. Napoli, Margheri di Guiseppe. 16mo. xxix, 160 pp. 3 lire.
- Commentaria in Aristotelem graeca. Edita consilio et auctoritate academiae litterarum regiae borussicae. Vol. I. et Vol. II. pars II. 8vo. Berlin, G. Reimer. 63 Mk.
- [Contents: I. Alexandri Aphrodisiensis in Aristotelis metaphysica commentaria edidit M. Hayduck. xiii, 919 pp. 35 Mk.—II. 2. Alexandri Aphrodisiensis in Aristotelis topicorum libros octo commentaria edidit M. Wallies. I, 712 pp. 28 Mk.]
- Corpus inscriptionum latinarum. Vol. III. Supplementum II. et Vol. VIII. Supplementum I. Folio. Berlin, G. Reimer. 81 Mk.
- [Contents: III. Inscriptionum Orientis et Illyrici latinarum supplementum ediderunt T. Mommsen, O. Hirschfeld, A. Domaszewski. Fasc. II. (pp. 1373–1667). 29 Mk.—Vol. VIII. Inscriptionum Africae proconsularis latinarum supplementum ediderunt R. Cagnat et J. Schmidt, commentariis J. Schmidt. pp. 1143–1666. Boards. 52 Mk.]
- Culex*. Carmen Vergilio ascriptum recensuit et enarravit F. Leo. Accedit copia elegia. 12mo. 122 pp. Berlin, Weidmann. 3 Mk.
- Czyżewicz* (A.) Quibus poeticis vocabulis Cornelius Tacitus sermonem suum ornauerit. 8vo. 16 pp. Brody. 50 pf.
- De Tacitei sermonis proprietatibus praecipue quae ad poetarum dicendi genus pertinent. Pars II. 8vo. 45 pp. Brody, F. West. 1 Mk. each.
- Dareste* (R.) Aristote *Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία*, édition princeps. Londres, 1891. 4to. 17 pp. Paris, Imprimerie Nationale.
- Dionysii Halicarnasensis antiquitatum romanarum quae supersunt edidit C. Jacoby. Vol. III. 12mo. iii, 400 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 3 Mk.
- Dissertationes philogae Vindobonenses. Vol. III. 8vo. iii, 373 pp. Leipzig. G. Freytag. 10 Mk.
- Dittenberger* (G.) Commentatio de inscriptione Thiseiensi ad Emphyteusos jus spectante. Pr. Halle 91. 14 S. 4to.
- Dübi* (H.) Studien zur Geschichte der römischen Altertümer in der Schweiz. 4to. 42 pp. Bern, Haber & Co. 1 Mk. 20.
- Euripides*, Alceste. Texte grec avec un commentaire critique et explicatif et une notice par H. Weil. 8vo. 92 pp. Paris, Hachette et Cie. 2 fr. 50.
- Hippolyte. Texte grec accompagné d'une notice, d'un argument analytique et de notes en français. 16mo. 95 pp. Paris, Hachette et Cie. 1 fr.
- Hippolitos. Griechisch und deutsch von Ulr. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf. 8vo. 245 pp. Berlin, Weidmann. 8 Mk.
- Freudenthal* (M.) Die Erkenntnislehre Philos von Alexandria. 78 pp. Berlin, Calvary & Co. 2 Mk. [Berliner Studien für Classische Philologie, XIII. Heft I.]
- Gabotto* (F.) Appunti sulla fortuna di alcuni autori romani nel medio evo. 16mo. 72 pp. Verona, Tedeschi & Figlio.
- Gardthausen* (V.) Augustus und seine Zeit. [In 2 Theilen à 2 Bde.] Theil I. Band I. und II. Theil, I. Halbband. 8vo. Leipzig, B. G. Teubner. 16 Mk.
- [I. 1, x, 481 pp. 10 Mk.—II. 1, 276 pp. 6 Mk.]
- Gaudean* (B.) De Petri Joannis Perpiniani vita et operibus. Accedunt nonnulla opera Perpiniani nondum edita. Diss. Toulouse 91. ix, 207 S. 8vo.
- Gebhard* (F.) Gedankengang Horazischer Oden in dispositioneller Uebersicht, nebst einem kritisch-exegetischen Anhang. 8vo. x, 63, 30 pp. München, Lindauer. 1 Mk. 50.
- [Extract: Festgruss an die 41 Versammlung deutscher Philologen und Schulmänner von dem Lehrerkollegium des königlichen Wilhelms-Gymnasiums.]
- Gelzer* (H.) Analecta Byzantina. 4to. 18 pp. Jena. 50 pf.
- Giescke* (A.) De philosophorum veterum quae ad exilium spectant sententiis. 8vo. vi, 134 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 2 Mk.
- Girard* (P.) Education athénienne au Ve et IVe Siècle avant Jésus-Christ. Illustrations. 8vo. viii, 344 pp. Paris, Hachette et Cie. 10 fr.
- Goebel* (E.) Homerische Blätter. Lexikologische kritische und exegetische Beiträge zu Homer. 4to. 24 pp. Paderborn, F. Schöningh. 80 pf.
- Götze* (K.) Quaestiones Eumenianae. Pr. Leer, 91. 49 S. 8vo.
- Grabreliefs, die Attischen. Herausgegeben im Auftrage der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Wien von Conze. Lieferung 2. Folio. pp. 17–40. Illustrations. Berlin, W. Spemann. 60 Mk.

- Graf (M.)** Die 15. Epode des Horaz. Ein Beitrag zur Kritik und Erklärung der Horazischen Epoden. Gel. München 91. 7 S. 8vo.
- Gsell (S.)** Fouilles dans la nécropole de Vulci. 4to. 576 pp. Plates. Paris, Thorin.
- Guzdek (J.)** De vocabuli "animus" apud T. Macrium Plantum usu. Pr. Brzezany 91. 30 S. 8vo.
- Harvardt (M.)** De Aristophanis irrisionibus earumque fide et usu. Particula II. Pr. Allenstein 91. 16 S. 4to.
- Hasebrauk (G.)** Kaiser Septimius Severus. Teil II. Pr. Holzminde 91. 34 S. 4to.
- Heikel (J. A.)** Beiträge zur Erklärung von Plutarchs Biographie des Perikles. 4to. 18 pp. Helsingfors. 1 Mk. 20.
- Heim (R.)** De rebus magicis Marcelli Medici. Gel. Bonn 91. 19 S. 8vo.
- Heller (A.)** Die Cariae Lydiaeque sacerdotibus. Diss. Leipzig 91. 35 S. 8vo.
- Herbig (G.)** Zur Chronologie der pindarischen Siegesgesänge Jsthm. III/IV and Jsthm. VII. Gel. München 91. 17 S. 8vo.
- Hertz (E.)** De praecipuarum praepositionum loci usu Lucretiano. Diss. Helsingfors 91. viii, 67 S. 8vo.
- Ησιόδου τὰ πάντα καὶ ἐρμηνείας Καραίου Σίττα (Ζωγραφεῖος Ἑλληνικὴ βιβλιοθήκη τόμος γ').** 8vo. xiii, 645 pp. Portrait. 1889. Leipzig Teubner. 10 Mk.
- Hildebrandt (P.)** De causa Polystrati. Gel. München 91. 5 S. 8vo.
- Hüller von Gaertringen (F.)** Zur arkadischen Königsliste des Pausanias. [Extract: Festschrift zur Feier des 25 jährigen Gymnasialjubiläums.] 8vo. 19 pp. Jauer. 1 Mk. 20.
- Hoccelet (J. J.)** Mitteilungen über den in den Pfingstferien 1890 in Bonn und Trier stattgehabten archäologischen Kursus. Pr. Köln 91. 24 S. u. 1 Taf. 4to.
- Homer.** L'Iliade (libro undecimo) travestita alla fiorentina di M. Ricci. 16mo. viii, 68 pp. Firenze. 1 lira.
- Horace.** L'Art poétique expliqué littéralement, traduit en français et annoté par Taillefert. 12mo. 76 pp. Paris, Hachette et Cie.
- Satire. Volgarizzamento di M. Grappa. 8vo. 62 pp. Reggio Emilia. Calderini e figlia. 1 lira.
- Flaccus Q. recensuit G. Mewes. Vol. II. 12mo. iv, 188 pp. Berlin, Calvary & Co. 1 Mk. 80.
- Hultsch (F.)** Die erzählenden Zeitformen des Polybios. Ein Beitrag zur Syntax der griechischen Sprache. Abhandlungen I. [Extract: Abhandlungen der königlichen sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaft.] 8vo. 210 pp. Leipzig, S. Hirzel. 7 Mk.
- Hümmerich (F.)** Die Pindar-Handschriften Bund D in Nem. und Jsthm. Gel. München 91. 14 S. 8vo.
- Inama (V.)** Letteratura greca. 24mo. vii, 231 pp. Milano, Hoepli.
- Inscriptiones antiquae orae septentrionalis Ponti Euxini graecae et latinae edidit M. B. Latyscher.** Vol. II. Inscriptiones regni bosporani continens. 4to. lvi, 351 pp. Maps. St. Petersburg. 30 Mk.
- Jahnke (R.)** De nuntio sagaci comoedia. Gel. Bonn 91. 25 S. 8vo.
- Jahrbuch, biographisches für Alterthumskunde.** Begründet von C. Bursian, herausgegeben von I. v. Müller. Jahrgang xiii. 1890. 8vo. iii, 107 pp. Berlin, Calvary & Co. 5 Mk.
- Karo (G.)** Handschriftliche und kritische Beiträge zum bellum Hispaniense. Gel. München 91. 14 S. 8vo.
- Kershaw (J. B.)** Die megarischen Psephismen. Gel. München 91. 16 S. 8vo.
- Klímek (P.)** Kritische Bemerkungen zum Texte der Schriften des Synesius. Pr. Breslau 91. 13 S. 8vo.
- Klötzer (R. F. J.)** Die griechische Erziehung in Homeri Ilias und Odyssee. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Erziehung im Altertum. Dissertatio. 4to. 29 pp. Zwickau. 1 Mk. 25.
- Knatz (F.)** Empedoclea. Gel. Bonn 91. 9 S. 8vo.
- Kobilinski (G. v.)** Die gebräuchlichsten lateinischen Synonyma. Pr. Königsberg 91. 33 S. 8vo.
- Koster (E. B.)** Studia tragico-homerica. Diss. Darentiae 91. viii, 94 S. 8vo.
- Kreuser (A.)** Die Briefsammlung des jüngeren Plinius als Schullektüre. Pr. Prüm 91. 13 S. 4to.
- Kreutzer (J.)** Die Thronfolgeordnung im Principat. Pr. Köln 91. 23 S. 4to.
- Kroll (W.)** De Q. Aurelii Symmachi studiis graecis et latinis. Pars. I. Diss. Breslau 91. 41 S. 8vo.
- Kunze (J.)** Die Gotteslehre des Irenaeus. (I.) Diss. Leipzig 91. 47 S. 8vo.
- La Broise (K. de).** Mamerti Claudiani vita ejusque doctrina de anima hominis. Diss. Paris 91. xxv, 221 S. 8vo.
- Landgraf (G.)** Das Bellum Alexandrinum und der Codex Ashburnhamensis. Gel. München 91. 23 S. 8vo.
- Lateinische Schulgrammatik. 8vo. vi, 246 pp. Bamberg, Buchner's Verlag. 3 Mk.
- Larfeld (W.)** Jahresbericht über die griechischen Inschriften. Back (F.) Jahresbericht über die Mythologie aus den Jahren 1886-1890. 1-256 pp. 8vo. Berlin, Calvary & Co. 10 Mk. 80.
- [Jahresbericht über die Fortschritte der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft. Supplement-Band zur Neuen Folge. Heft 1-3].
- Leipold (H.)** Ueber die Sprache des Juristen Aemilinus Papinianus. 8vo. 80 pp. Passau, M. Waldbauer. 1 Mk. 10.
- Lexicon, ausführliches, der griechischen und römischen Mythologie, herausgegeben von W. H. Roscher.** Lieferung 19. 8vo. (Band II. columns 161-320). Leipzig, Teubner. Each 2 Mk.
- Leyds (R.)** De ordine rerum Ol. 107 gestarum imprimis de Demosthenis orationis in Midiam temporibus. Diss. Groningen 91. viii, 88 S. 8vo.
- Libanii apologia Socratis recensuit notisque instruxit Y. H. Rogge.** 8vo. v, 96 pp. Amsterdam. 3 Mk. 60.
- Linse (A.)** De P. Ovidio Nasone vocabulorum inventore. Diss. Tübingen 91. 68 S. 8vo.
- Lipsius.** Ueber das neu aufgefundene Buch des Aristoteles vom Staat der Athener. S.-A. Leipzig 91. 29 S. 8vo.
- Livii (Tit.)** Ab urbe condita liber ix. Für den Schulgebrauch erklärt von F. Luterbacher. Map. 8vo. 118 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 1 Mk. 20.
- Löher (v.)** Zustände im römisch-deutschen Kulturland. S.-A. München 91. 22 S. 8vo.
- Lohmeyer (C.)** De Dracontii carminum ordine. Gel. Bonn 91. 16 S. 8vo.
- Lubker (F.)** Reallexicon des klassischen Altertums für Gymnasien. 7te verbesserte Auflage, herausgegeben von M. Erler. 8vo. vii, 1322 pp. Illustrations and Map. Leipzig, Teubner. 14 Mk.
- Lutz (L.)** Die Casus Adverbien bei den attischen Rednern. Beitrag zur historischen Grammatik der griechischen Sprache. 8vo. 40 pp. Würzburg. 1 Mk. 20.
- Maass (E.)** De Lenaeo et Delphino commentatio. Pr. Greifswald 91. 20 S. 4to.
- Marquardt (J.)** De l'organisation militaire chez les

- Romains. Traduit par M. Brissand. Tome XI. Illustrations. 8vo. iv, 419 pp. Paris, Thorin.
- Mascari (R.) Per Saffo. (Impressioni di studio). 8vo. 20 pp. Terranova-Sicilia, Serodato.
- Mayr (A.) Ueber Tendenz und Abfassungszeit des sophokleischen Oedipus auf Kolonos. Gel. München 91. 17 S. 8vo.
- Mchliss. Ueber die Bedeutung von καλός bei Homer. Pr. Eisleben 91. 20 S. 4to.
- Meifert (C.) De Sophoclis codicibus. Diss. Halle 91. 74 S. 8vo.
- Meister (R.) Zur griechischen Epigraphik und Grammatik. S.-A. Leipzig 91. 40 S. 8vo.
- Mering (F.) De aliteratione Luciliana. Pr. Wattencheid 91. 12 S. 4to.
- Meyer (P.) Die Aristoteles Politik und die 'Αθηναίων πολιτεία. Nebst einer Litteratur, Uebersicht. 12mo. 72 pp. Bonn, F. Cohen. 1 Mk. 20.
- Meyer (W.) Der accentuirte Satzschluss in der griechischen Prosa vom iv. bis xvi. Jahrhundert. 8vo. 28 pp. Göttingen, Demerlich. 1 Mk.
- Nachlese zu den Spruchversen des Menander und Anderer. S.-A. München 91. 31 S. 8vo.
- Miller (A.) Die Alexandergeschichte nach Strabo. Teil II. 4to. ii, 25 pp. Würzburg, Stahl. 1 Mk. 50.
- Mommsen (A.) Ueber die Zeit der Olympien. 8vo. 102 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 2 Mk. 80.
- Moschopoli in Batrachomyomachiam commentarii pars II. ab A. Ludwig edita. Pr. Königsberg 91. 26 S. 4to.
- Müller (H.) De Teletis elocutione. Dissertatio. 8vo. 75 pp. Freiburg i/Br. 1 Mk.
- Murray (A. T.) On Parody and Paratragedia in Aristophanes, with especial references to his scenes and situations. 8vo. 50 pp. Berlin, Mayer and Müller. 1 Mk. 50.
- Nassau-Noordevier (M.) Metaphorae Aristophaneae. Diss. Delphis-Batavorum 91. viii, 100 S. 8vo.
- Naumann (F.) De verborum cum praepositionibus compositorum usu Ammiani Marcellini. Pr. Stendal 91. 20 S. 4to.
- Neff (C.) De Paulo Diacono Festi epitomatore. Diss. Leipzig 91. 54 S. 8vo.
- Neuhaus (O.) Die Quellen des Trogus Pompejus in der persischen Geschichte. Teil IV. Pr. Hohenstein 91. 25 S. 4to.
- Nessling (C.) De seviris Augustalibus. Dissertatio. 8vo. 51 pp. Giessen. 1 Mk.
- Nitzsch. Uebersetzung des Sophokleischen Philoktet. Teil I. Pr. Bielefeld 91. 16 S. 4to.
- Nordmeyer (G.) De Octaviae Fabulae fontibus historicis. Gel. Bonn 91. 15 S. 8vo.
- Oehmichen (G.) Metrologische Beiträge. Gel. München 91. 38 S. 8vo.
- Oppian's des Jüngeren Gedicht von der Jagd, lib. II. 1-377, metrisch übersetzt und mit Bemerkungen von Max Müller. Virgiliana. Die grammatischen Schriften des Galliers Virgilius Maro textkritisch untersucht von T. Stangl. 8vo. 50, 137 pp. München. 1 Mk. 20.
- Paulin (E.) Thermes de Dioclétien. Folio. 28 pp. Plates. Paris. Didot et Cie. 220 frcs.
- Peroutka (E.) Aristoteles o učinku tragoedie. Pr. Raudnice 91. 42 S. 8vo.
- Peters (B.) Beiträge zur Jugendgeschichte Oktavians. Pr. Brilon 91. 29 S. 4to.
- Pfudel (E.) Die Wiederholungen bei Homer. I. Beabsichtigte Wiederholungen. Pr. Liegnitz 91. 36 S. 4to.
- Philonis de aeternitate mundi. Edidit et prolegomenis instruxit F. Cumont. 8vo. xxxii, 76 pp. Berlin, G. Reimer. 4 Mk.
- Pichlmayr (F.) Zu den Caesares des Sextus Aurelius Victor. Gel. München 91. 12 S. 8vo.
- Pindar's sicilische Oden, nebst den epizephyrischen. Mit Prosaübersetzung und Erläuterungen von E. Böhmer. 8vo. xx, 116 pp. Bonn, F. Cohen. 5 Mk.
- Plato. Apologie de Socrate publiée avec une introduction et des notes par C. Cucuel. 12mo. 139 pp. Paris, Colin et Cie.
- Criton, ou le devoir du citoyen. Texte grec accompagné d'une introduction et de notes par C. Waddington. 16mo. 56 pp. Paris, Hachette et Cie. 50 cent.
- Plautus. I prigionieri di guerra. Versione metrica di De Martiis. 8vo. 56 pp. Torino, E. Loescher. 1 lira.
- I tre danari. Versione metrica di De Martiis. 8vo. 63 pp. Torino, E. Loescher. 1 lira.
- La pentolina. Versione metrica di De Martiis. 8vo. 50 pp. Torino, E. Loescher. 1 lira.
- Stico. Versione metrica di De Martiis. 8vo. 45 pp. Torino, E. Loescher. 1 lira.
- Pomeranz (B.) La Grèce et la Judée dans l'antiquité. Coup d'œil sur la vie intellectuelle et morale des anciens Grecs et Hébreux. Partie I. 12mo. 93 pp. Jaroslaw. 2 Mk. 40.
- Poppelreuter (H.) Zur Psychologie des Aristoteles, Theophrast, Strabo. Pr. Saarbrücken 91. 52 S. 8vo.
- Preuner (A.) Jahresbericht über die Mythologie aus den Jahren 1876-1885. Heft 4. IV. 385-512 pp. 8vo. Berlin, Calvary & Co. 3 Mk. 60.
- [Jahresbericht über die Fortschritte der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft. Supplement-Band. Heft 5.]
- Prott (J. de) De amphora Neapolitana fabulae satyrica apparatus scenicum representante. Gel. Bonn 91. 13 S. 8vo.
- Regel (W.) Analecta Byzantino-russica. 8vo. cliv, 143 pp. Plates. St. Petersburg. 1 Mk. 80.
- Rehm (A.) Pindar und die Aigiden. Gel. München 91. 14 S. 8vo.
- Reich (H.) Die Frage der sogenannten zweiten Redaktion der Reden vom Kranze. Gel. München 91. 51 S. 8vo.
- Reure (C. O.) De scriptorum ac litteratorum hominum, cum Romanis imperatoribus inuicitiis. (Thesis). 8vo. 126 pp. Paris, Belin frères.
- Les gens de lettres et leurs protecteurs à Rome. 8vo. xiii, 403 pp. Paris, Belin frères.
- Rhoen (C.) Die ältere Topographie der Stadt Aachen. 8vo. ii, 140 pp. Plan. Aachen, Cremer. 2 Mk.
- Richter (O.) Die älteste Wohnstätte des römischen Volkes. Pr. Berlin 91. 13 S. u. 1 Tafel. 4to.
- Roesener (B.) Bemerkungen über die dem Andronikos von Rhodos mit Unrecht zugewiesenen Schriften. Teil II. Pr. Schweidnitz 91. 26 S. 4to.
- Rohden (P. v.) Publius Quinctilius Varus. Gel. Steglitz. 7 S. 4to.
- Rose (G.) Das Psephisma des Kannonos. Gel. München 91. 14 S. 8vo.
- Rudolph (F.) Quellen und Schriftstellerei des Athenaios. [Extract "Philologus."] 8vo. 52 pp. Göttingen, Dieterich. 1 Mk. 20.
- Schaefer (M.) De iteratis apud Theognidem distichis. Diss. Halle 91. 37 S. 8vo.
- Sagane (K.) Ueber den Gebrauch des Pronomens ἑκαστος bei Herodot. Gel. Breslau 91. 17 S. 4to.
- Schedae philologiae. Hermanno Usener a sodalibus seminarii regii Bonensis oblatae. 8vo. v, 145 pp. Bonn, F. Cohen. 3 Mk.
- Scheel (Ae.) De Gorgianae disciplinae vestigiis. Diss. Rostock 90. 60 S. 8vo.
- Scheuer (F.) De Tacitei de oratoribus dialogi codicum

- nexu et fide. Pars I. Diss. Breslau 91. 32 S. 8vo.
- Schmidt* (A.) Antik és modern szinpad. Pr. Kassan 91. 13 S. 8vo.
- De Pindari carmine Nemeorum tertio. Pr. Seehausen 91. 27 S. 4to.
- Schneider* (S.) Zaginiony biograf Peryklesa. (Der verloren gegangene Biograph des Perikles.) Pr. Przemysl 91. 41 S. 8vo.
- Schoene* (H.) Galeniana. Gel. Bonn 91. 6 S. 8vo.
- Schrader* (H.) De archaeologiae Thucydideae apud veteres scriptores auctoritate. Bubendey, de loco Thucydideo vii, 28 restituendo.—Klussian, die Kämpfe am Eurymedon. 4to. 24 pp. Hamburg, 1 Mk. 60.
- Schreiner*. Das Militär-Diplom von Eining. S.-A. München 91. 25 S. u. 1 Taf. 8vo.
- Schulze* (P.) Bemerkungen zu Lucian's philosophischen Schriften. Pr. Dessau 91. 10 S. 4to.
- Schwarz* (J.) Die Demokratie von Athen. (Demokratie I.) Neue Titel-Ausgabe. 8vo. lxix, 749 pp. Leipzig, Friedrich. 12 Mk.
- Schwabe* (L.) Geschichte der archaeologischen Sammlung der Universität Tübingen. 8vo. 41 pp. Tübingen. 1 Mk. 80.
- Schwartz* (E.) De numerorum usu Euripideo capita selecta. Pr. Kiel 91. 24 S. 4to.
- Schwarz* (E.) Quaestiones Jonicae. Pr. Rostock 91. 18 S. 4to.
- Seibel* (M.) Zu Aristoteles περί ποικίλης. Gel. München 91. 9 S. 8vo.
- Seiler* (J.) De particulis copulativis quaestiones grammaticae et metricae. Diss. Halle 91. 37 S. 8vo.
- Semenoff* (A. v.) Etymologisches über einige römische Personennamen. Gel. München 91. 5 S. 8vo.
- Semler* (C.) Die Gleichnisse Homers aus der Natur und ihre Bedeutung für den Unterricht und die Erziehung. Pr. Dresden 91. 28 S. 8vo.
- Sittl* (K.) Die Patrizierzeit der griechischen Kunst. 24. Programm des von Wagnerschen Kunst-Institutes der Universität Würzburg. 4to. v, 37 pp. 3 plates. Würzburg, Stahel. 2 Mk.
- Speyer* (J. S.) Observationes et emendationes. 8vo. 79 pp. Groningen, J. B. Wolters. 2 Mk. 50.
- Stadelmann* (F.) Erziehung und Unterricht bei den Griechen und Römern. 8vo. 217 pp. Triest, Schimpff. 3 Mk. 50.
- Stangl* (T.) Zur Kritik der lateinischen Rhetoren und Grammatiker. Gel. München 91.
- Virgiliana. Die grammatischen Schriften des Galliers Virgilius Maro, auf Grund einer erstmaligen Vergleichung der Handschrift von Amiens und einer erneuten der Handschriften von Paris und Neapel textkritisch untersucht. 8vo. 137 pp. München. 3 Mk.
- Stein* (E. von) Das Hannibalische Truppenverzeichnis bei Livius xxi. c. 22. 8vo. 37 pp. Berlin, Calvary & Co. 1 Mk. 50. [Berliner Studien für classische Philologie. xii. Heft 2.]
- Steinmann* (V.) Studie homerská. Pr. Königgrätz 91. 19 S. 8vo.
- Stern* (W.) Diodor und Theopompos. Pr. Durlach 91. 25 S. 4to.
- Stöcklein* (J.) De causa Cluentiana. De iudicio Juniano. Gel. München 91. 15 S. 8vo.
- Stühr, Engel, Widemann, Schmidinger, Vogel*, Curae criticae in Aristotelis Politica. Gel. München 91. 18 S. 8vo.
- Stravoskiadis* (A.) Achilles Tatius. Ein Nachahmer des Plato, Aristoteles, Plutarch und Aelian. Diss. Erlangen 89. 36 S. 8vo.
- Studien, Prager philologische, herausgegeben von O. Keller, Heft 3. 8vo. Prag. H. Dominicus. 1 Mk. 40.
- [Contents: A. Ludewig quomodo Plinius major, Seneca philosophus, Curtius Rufus Quintilianus, Cornelius Tacitus, Plinius Minor particula quidem usi sint. Fasciculus I. 76 pp.]
- Sophokles*, Elektra. Deutsch von A. Müller. 12mo. 119 pp. Meldorf, C. Albers. 1892. 1 Mk. 20.
- Oedipus Rex annoté par I. Legard. 16mo. xx, 104 pp. Paris, Poussielgue.
- Philoktetes. Mit Einleitung und Anmerkungen für den Schulgebrauch herausgegeben von J. Rappold. 2 Theile. 8vo. Wien. A. Hölder. 1 Mk. 50.
- [Contents: I. Einleitung und Text. iv, 75 pp. 90 Pfg. II. Anmerkungen. 48 pp. 60 Pfg.]
- Tacitus*, Opera quae supersunt, ad fidem codicum Mediceorum ab J. G. Baitero denuo excussorum ceterorumque optimorum librorum recensuit J. C. Orellius. Vol. II. Germania, Dialogus de claris oratoribus. Agricola. Historiae. Editio II. curaverunt Schweizer-Sidler, Andresen, Meiser. Fasciculus 6. Historiarum, liber III. Editio C. Meiser. 8vo. 391–456 pp. Berlin, Calvary & Co. 4 Mk. 50.
- Tetzner* (R.) Der Gebrauch des Infinitivs in Xenophons Anabasis. Pr. Doberan 91. 26 S. 8vo.
- Thurot and Chatelet*, Prosodie latine suivie d'un appendice sur la prosodie grecque. 2<sup>de</sup> édition. 12mo. iii, 145 pp. Paris, Hachette et Cie. 1 fr. 50.
- Virgil*, Opera. Texte et commentaire revus avec Carte de l'Itinéraire d'Énée par Ch. Lebaigue. 12mo. 588 pp. Paris, Belin Frères.
- Vogelreuther* (O.) Geschichte des griechischen Unterrichts in deutschen Schulen seit der Reformation. 8vo. iii, 67 pp. Hannover, C. Meyer. 1 Mk. 50.
- Waille* (V.) De Caesareae monumentis quae supersunt vel de Caesarea ex titulis reliquisque a temporibus regis Jubae usque ad annum a Christo 372 (Thesis). 8vo. 111 pp. Alger, Fontana & Co.
- Waldeck* (A.) Lateinische Schulgrammatik nebst einem Anhang über Stilistik für alle Lehranstalten. 8vo. viii, 144 pp. Halle, Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses. 1 Mk. 20.
- Weigmann* (F.) Ueber den Rhythmus des Asklepios-Päan. Gel. München 91. 12 S. 8vo.
- Weise* (F. O.) Charakteristik der lateinischen Sprache. Ein Versuch. 8vo. 141 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 2 Mk. 40.
- Werth* (A.) De Ciceronis et Senecae locis aliquot. Gel. Bonn 91. 12 S. 8vo.
- Animadversiones ad Hygini fabulas. Gel. Bonn 91. 10 S. 8vo.
- Westphal* (F.) Die Präpositionen bei Xenophon. (Fortsetzung.) Fr. Freienwalde 91. 19 S. 4to.
- Wiesner*, Horazische Oden des 3. u. 4. Buches in freier Nachdichtung. Pr. Pless 91. 22 S. 4to.
- Zenonis* Citiensis de rebus physicis doctrinae fundamentum ex adiectis fragmentis constituit R. Troost. 87 pp. Berlin, Calvary & Co.
- [Berliner Studien für Classische Philologie. xii. Heft 3.]
- Ziebarth* (E.) De novo paeane in honorem Aesculapii facto. Gel. München 91. 9 S. 8vo.
- Ziehen* (L.) Ad Ciceronis de re publica libros. Gel. Bonn. 91. 6 S. 8vo.
- Zielinski* (T.) Boperyóraw. Gel. München 91. 7 S. 8vo.
- Zschau* (H.) Ueber Horat. carmin. iv, 8. Pr. Schwedt a. O. 91. 12 S. 4to.
- Zvár* (E.) A homérsék hasznos és káros hatása a növényekre. Pr. Szegedin 91. 31 S. 8vo.